

THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1869.

ART. I.—THE TRUE IDEA OF LIBERAL EDUCATION.

BY TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN UNION COLLEGE.

IT is quite common to define education from its Latin etymology. *Educatio* and *eductio*, it is said, are the same. It is the leading or drawing forth of the soul from its chaotic state into one of order, regularity, culture, finished form. A trite comparison is furnished by the statue in the block of marble. As the sculptor brings out form, proportion, beauty, from the formless mass; so education forms the man, develops him, gives character to that which before existed characterless and undistinguished in the common ore or mass of unwrought humanity. We doubt whether those who first used the term had so transcendental an idea as this. The application of the word came, most likely in the first place, from the simple act of *leading forth* the child from the nursery to the common school room; just as in Greek *παιδαγωγός* (pedagogue), the servant who led the boy by the hand, and *παιδαγωγία* (pedagogy), had the same primary idea. It is, however, a very pretty notion, very suggestive; and we have, therefore, no objection to making it the general ground of our very general remarks.

It is not safe, however, to reason from a simile, or a metaphor, without using great discrimination. This figure of the

statue, if pushed too far, favors too much the false notion that education, or the *drawing out* of the man, consists wholly in what is called the development of his faculties. If there is great truth in this idea, there is also connected with it no small amount of error. What makes it, sometimes, the more mischievous, is the fact that it is a theory often accompanied by a practice derived from an opposite philosophy. There is much talk everywhere of development, whilst in fact some of our favorite methods of instruction would seem to aim at imparting the greatest amount of fact knowledge, and that too of the most outward kind. In shunning both extremes, it may, indeed, be said that education is the proper *unfolding* of the human mind, and that the means for effecting this is the proper introduction of proper knowledge from without. The soul is not a mere *capacity*, a place for holding; it is not a mere *faculty* or power; it is not a mere system of blank spiritual energies, without any inward spiritual light to give them meaning and direction. The soul has a knowledge of its own, ideas of its own: we can never give up this until we are prepared to give up all philosophy, and all religion along with it; but this inborn knowledge becomes consciousness when it is evoked by outward things, and brings its innate rules to measure outward things; to give connecting law, and shaping form, to what would be, otherwise, shapeless outward facts. Hence external knowledge is needed, but it is to open, not to fill the soul. It comes, not to pour in, but to let out, the spiritual light from which alone it derives its own true visibility. It must be adapted to this; and therefore it is that, in education, much more depends on a right selection than on the amount or accumulation of external science.

Education then is not wholly development nor wholly outward acquisition. Both are, at the same time, means and ends, and both mutually act and react upon each other. The introduction of outward knowledge tends to call out and strengthen certain powers and ideas of the soul: these, again, when thus cleared and elevated, enable us better to survey the whole field of truth, and to estimate aright the comparative value of different kinds of knowledge. Thus both go to form that intellectual harmony,

that healthy mind, which we regard as peculiar to the *liberally* educated man. A right position in the domain of truth is of far more importance than any amount of mere accumulated knowledge. The acquisition of a true central point from which whatever we do see, be it ever so little, shall be seen in its true place, and in its proper relations, is of immensely more value than a wider field of outward vision, embracing a vast range of objects, but where every thing is distorted by the parallaxes and refractions, the effects of the false stations *from* which, and the perverted media *through* which, they are viewed.

There is another error connected, we think, with the perversion of the simile aforesaid. The statue is *educed*, brought out from the common mass of marble. So the soul, it is said, is *educated*, that is, brought out from the unwrought common mind; it is chipped and polished into individual distinctness. This will do very well for a figure, but its application may be false and mischievous. It may be meant, and generally is meant, that the man's individuality, or his originality as some would say, is *educed*. This individual, so brought out, is made to think *for* himself, and of himself: he is released from the trammels of authority, and from dependence on other minds. Now we do not hesitate to take a position which may be styled the converse, if not the opposite, of the preceding. With more of truth may it be said that the grand design of education, certainly of *liberal* education, is to *educe* or draw us out of our native individualism into the common humanity; and that the most thoroughly and liberally educated, be their knowledge more or less, are those who have experienced the most of that humanizing process through which our views are continually more and more directed to that destiny, and that knowledge, which pertains to man as man, in distinction from that which concerns him in his individual, partial, and professional relations.

It is in this sense that the greatest men have ever been the least original; and that the liberally educated man, the true scholar, has more of catholicity, more feeling with and for the masses, than the self-styled reformer who claims their hearing

on the ground that he has thought out *for himself*, and wrought out *for himself*, all the hard problems of humanity. It was not pedantry, but a sound philosophy, that gave the name *humanitas*, or *studia humanitatis*, to erudition, education, liberal knowledge; that culture, in short, that gives a man a community of sentiment, a common rational life, with the thoughtful and reasoning humanity of all ages. As an illustration of our general position here, it may be said that this same uniting and harmonizing process may be traced in any one science, or any one art, viewed solely in reference to itself. Before musical culture, for example, "each man has his psalm" and his song, or what is absurdly called his natural taste. When, however, the attention is closely given to music as a science, or a system, it is soon found to be something more than a matter of *sense* and individual ears; it is seen to have a common and universal *reason*. In proportion to cultivation, the mere sense tastes of individuals converge, more and more, to a common standard. As real advance is made, there is discovered, more and more, a unity in which all truly cultivated musicians agree, and which, from this very fact, is shown to be the true natural taste delivered from the individual monstrosities. The best music is ever the most catholic. Nothing could be further from the individual conceits, and yet every individual who has the least ear or soul for music appreciates the strains of Handel. Nay, more, he thinks it is just the kind of music that he *could* have made, certainly that he *would* have made, himself.

As it is with this single branch of scientific culture, so also, though in much higher degree, is it with that general educational culture of which we speak; consisting in a harmonious combination of all departments of knowledge, philosophical, philological, physical, political, social, moral, and theological. Just in the ratio in which it has been thorough and extensive, will there be a drawing together of all cultivated minds, with a merging of those ideas so prized for their fancied novelty, and which grew out of the individualizing spirit. Just as the true educational process goes on, the love of truth takes the place of the love of originality; and these conceits are dropped, one by

one, as dogmas and ideas that are found to have been broached over and over again in other forms, and exploded again and again in other ages of the world. Whilst this is taking place in the one direction, there is brought out more and more that conservative harmony on all great fundamental truths which is the only basis on which can be expected any true or permanent progress. In this way, too, the individual strength and characteristics, and power for good, are more truly exhibited, more truly made available, because grounded on so sure and catholic a foundation. The greatest men, intellectually and morally, have ever stood out most prominently as individuals, not from mere individualizing or personally original traits, but from the very fact that more than others of their age and nation, did they represent the catholic mind of humanity.

We can only give here some of the most general views in respect to the nature and design of that discipline we style education; and first let us consider the legitimate extent of the term. It is a very common error to embrace under this word far more than, with any fairness, can be said to belong to it. It is sometimes extended to the animal and material, as well as the intellectual and moral nature. Gymnastics are called education. We have heard the term applied to dress and dietetics. Again, it is regarded as embracing, not only all that pertains to man, as man, in his most universal relations, but also the partial methods and processes, and corresponding culture, that pertain to particular arts, trades and occupations, by which one man, or one class of men, is distinguished from another. Beside the general intellectual discipline of the school and the college, together with the peculiar culture belonging to what have been styled the learned professions, it is made to take in the partial pursuits of partial objects, having little or nothing to connect them with science in general, or that body of truth which, in its principles, may be said to pertain to humanity, however partial and particular may be some of its applications. Hence some insist that agriculture and the mechanic arts are parts of education, not only in respect to the chemical and

mathematical science that may be partially demanded for some of them, but also in regard to their specific processes of operation. They should be taught, it is insisted, in our common schools; professorships should be established for them in our colleges.

Now there is a reason for including agriculture, in such an enlargement of the idea, which cannot well be urged in favor of other wealth-gaining pursuits. The cultivation of the earth was man's allotted destiny after the fall; it has been a universal occupation at all times, among all nations, and all classes of all nations. It thus becomes, not so much a partial employment, as a matter of general interest. It is confined to no one rank. The high and the low, the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, are found among the tillers of the soil. More than any of the trades, or partial occupations, is it connected with the general morals, the general intelligence, the social and political health. There is something in it more spiritual than in any other of the arts, and more favorable to contemplation, to pure and elevated thought. It is that employment of the hands in which a man is led to think most directly of God, His providence and ways. In an agricultural population there is generally found a sound and meditative, if not an acute intelligence. Hence there is reason in the opinion that would regard it as a branch of general knowledge, forming a proper part of fundamental and general education; not as belonging to a partial course intended only for those who mean to devote themselves to it for a livelihood, but for all classes, in the same manner as grammar, and mathematics, and moral philosophy. Thus regarded, it may become one of the liberal sciences, and a part of the *cultus humanus*, or liberal education. It was thus, as a matter of general interest, that the Church and State of Holland required it to be studied at the universities, especially by all theological students and future pastors, as being those who would come in closest communion with the common mind, and would have the most to do in forming the common intelligence.

For these reasons, a concession may be cheerfully made in favor of agriculture. When, however, the same claim is put in for other pursuits strictly partial, the question immediately arises, Where shall we stop? If one partial interest is to be embraced in this enlarged idea of education, and provision accordingly made for it in our seminaries, there can, consistently, be no bound assigned short of that which includes all. The mason, the builder, the mechanic of every kind, as well as the merchant and the manufacturer, may make the same demand, that their respective art or business should have its professorship and its special department in all our seminaries. No one, of course, will be so foolish as to think that the writer intends, or feels, any disrespect towards any of the occupations thus named. They are simply mentioned as furnishing examples of the absurd extremes to which we are driven in carrying out a false principle. Some of them, it is true, involve in their practice elementary principles of science. It would be hard to name any human employment that does not, more or less. These principles, however, belong to a course of general instruction, and their incidental connection with a particular pursuit gives it no right to have a special department in the schools; for then all must have such special departments, and thus, too—which is a far worse consequence—all theoretical science, all that is connected with the general culture of the mental functions and the growth of the general intelligence, must be crowded out for that which thus comes in, and so defiantly comes in, under the usurped names of the practical and the useful. In this way the highest utility is in danger of being utterly disregarded, and that most useful scheme of education—most useful as lying at the foundation of everything else—is in danger of being undervalued, broken up and in the end utterly lost. If we will have the one, we must yield to the other; and then surely there arises a problem of utilities, than which there is none more practical, as there can be none more vital in its bearing on our highest good.

What then is to be included in this term education—liberal education? We cannot learn every thing. Life is too short; *Vita brevis; ars longa*. Much we must be wholly ignorant of.

much, in every department, we must take as sheer empiricism. The utmost knowledge of the common school is necessarily very limited. That of the college may excel it in quality, but cannot greatly exceed it as far as mere quantity is concerned. Regarded merely as matter of accumulation, or remembered detail, it is but little that our best educated men carry away with them into subsequent life of the sciences once pursued, unless it may be in some particular branch to which they may have specially devoted themselves. The classical scholar forgets all but the most general principles of the mathematics. The mathematician loses, in a great degree, his actual knowledge of Greek and Latin; but its place in the soul has not become a blank. Far from it. All is not lost that lies out of one's subsequent chosen line of study. The value of scholastic discipline remains in the mental states it has produced, and which no other discipline could have produced. It is still with the man in the change that has passed upon his soul, making it impossible that he should ever be the man he would have been had he never received it. It is still with him, in the elevated view it has given of the general field of knowledge, and in the spiritual power it has created of resuming a familiarity with any one department, or of adding to it any kindred knowledge whenever it may be needed. In the attainment of such a position, knowledge is a means, and not itself the end. In this respect, quality is of more consequence than quantity. There is a vast difference between simply knowing a thing, and knowing it rightly; that is, knowing its true place and comparative value in its relation to other knowledge. Without this, ignorance is the safer, we may even say the higher, as it is the more hopeful state. There may be even an extensive knowledge, but so ill chosen, so out of connection with other departments—of consequence so ill proportioned, so distorted, so one-sided, so falsely magnified or so refracted through false media, as to be actually a source of darkness rather than light. The light that is in it is darkness—a darkness visible. It increases the soul's ignorance of itself by its accumulation. Its want of harmony with other parts diminishes that highest and most useful power—the power of

estimating aright the comparative value of different kinds of truth. There is much said at the present day of moral courage; courage to think, courage to speak. Perhaps one of the highest exercises of this moral courage would consist in a young man's daring to be ignorant of some things now esteemed a most important part of human knowledge.

What then is liberal education, and what ought to be included in the term? We venture to answer, although in the most general terms: It is that knowledge, and that mental discipline, which pertains to man as man, and which enables him best to perform that work which belongs to him as man, aside from those particular modifications of it which come out of the individual's own peculiar circumstances, calling or pursuit. Knowledge for the first of these ends is liberal education; it is for every man, as far as he has the means of obtaining it. Knowledge for the second is professional training, business training, partial training; it is for some men in distinction from others, to enable them to carry on their own particular job, trade, craft, mystery, or walk in life. The first is for the soul's sake—for the soul's health; the second is for the body in its widest wants, for a livelihood, for wealth, for what is called success in life—in a word, for things wholly unspiritual. There is a perfect analogy here between knowledge as the food of the soul, the bread of life, and the proper material food of the body. Some things we eat are not digested. Some parts of our bodily food pass off without incorporation; other portions enter into the blood; they are transmuted into our very life, and become permanent constituents of our organic personality. So there is a knowledge which is never digested, and never can be digested; it must ever remain crude, raw, fermenting. There is a knowledge which never truly enters into the soul: it lies on the outside; it forms no part, as it was never fitted to form a part, of our mental growth. There is again a knowledge which actually becomes a part of the soul. We speak without a figure here. It is transmuted into something higher than knowledge. We not only know it, but we live it spiritually. It is not a thing used occasionally for occasional purposes, like the outside prac-

tical knowledge not wanted for the soul, but becomes an integral constituent of our spiritual being, never more to be separated. It has changed the man, so that he can never be afterwards what he was before.

We have spoken of the work which belongs to man as man; but is there such a thing, it may be asked, apart from the special individual pursuit of each man, and for which therefore he ought to be specially fitted? Woe to us, if there be not. Alas for our dignity, if "all of life," for us, "be but to live;" if there be not a higher end to which life itself—life present and life to come—be but a means, and that transcending end the culture of the soul in all that is most akin to itself; in all that is least mutable, least transient, least partial; in the knowledge of the necessary and the eternal, the knowledge of things that pass not away. Yes, there is such a work of soul culture as an end in itself. The end of true education, of liberal education, is to enable us first to know, next to appreciate, and then to perform it. To set forth this whole work of man as man, would not only carry us out of our assigned limits, but would far transcend the speaker's power. It would carry us, too, into the domain of theology; for true education is essentially religious. Let us be content, therefore, to take its earthly side. This work of soul culture in our present state is but an *umbra*—a shadow of things belonging to a higher state of being. Plato could see that, when he called the mathematics holy, and reckoned as their high utility, not the measuring of lands on earth, nor even the geocentric survey of the heavens, but the great fact that they brought the soul of the youthful pupil nigh the paradigms of the eternal, and made it familiar with immutable truth. The training we call education may present features very different from those of the everlasting school; but it is allied to it, in that it seeks that knowledge which has most of the abiding element, the least of that "which is ever perishing in the using." It is exceedingly limited and imperfect, because it belongs to earth; but it has the elements of unlimited expansion. It embraces all that is highest and most universal in human relations, and, therefore, has it been

well called *humane*. With diffidence would we attempt to sketch its outlines.

As man, one needs to know, first of all, his relations to his Maker; and next to that, and through that, his relations to his fellow-men. Hence Theology and Ethics are parts, prime parts, of liberal education. He needs, secondly, a knowledge of what his race have been doing in the world, and of God's dealings with them; in other words, History sacred and profane. He wants to know, too, what the most thoughtful souls have thought on the great problems of origin and destiny in respect to man and the world; in other words, the History of Philosophy, and Philosophy itself. He wants to know, all he can know, of the wondrous world within him. Hence Psychology is an indispensable part of liberal education. He needs some knowledge of the wide world without him, in both its aspects, mathematical and physical: the first embracing those varieties of form, number, quantity, ratio, spatial or dynamical, under which matter is ever manifested, and through which, though temporal and finite itself, it is the manifestation or paradigm of the infinite and the eternal; the second embracing those motions and changes that make the domain of physics, wide indeed in its detail, but only belonging to liberal education so far as it connects itself with the catholic thinking, to the exclusion of professional knowledge or the accumulation of curious phenomenal facts. In other words, he needs an acquaintance with Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, including Chemistry, with certain other subdivisions of natural science, which, although they have only in modern times become objects of educational interest, are universal in their connections with our world and race. He needs an acquaintance with language, as the instrument, not merely for the *utterance*, but also for the *rational formation* of thought. With this is connected Philology, or the science of language, as one of the best means of mental discipline, and as opening the most direct avenue to the study of the soul itself, through this its most direct product and representative. He needs, as man, the kindred science of Logic: for its own intrinsic worth, as belonging, like mathe-

matics, to the department of the ever and immutably true; for its general utility, not in the discovery of truth, as its caricaturist would represent, but in its keen and instant detection of that false reasoning from which flow more evils to man than ever came from ignorance of natural knowledge. He needs not only a grammatical and logical acquaintance with language, but also some knowledge of the power of this noble instrument as used for persuasion, for exciting enthusiasm, for humanizing and elevating us in the communication from soul to soul of affection and emotion, as well as truth. Hence Rhetoric and Composition, and Oratory, and Criticism, become essential parts of liberal education. Certain forms and figures of language there are which become the medium through which we are raised above the present moment, made self-forgetful, full of unwonted aspiration; carried out of the temporal, the animal, the partial, into the spiritual, the universal, the eternal, the divine. Hence, for such refinement and exaltation of his humanity, he needs Poetry; that most useful as well as divine art of Poetry, which the clear unemotional intellect of Aristotle declared to be a more "important and a more serious thing than history." He wants not only to feel it, to enjoy it, but to know something about it; to learn the rules that regulate its harmonies, to understand the philosophy of its inspiration. For similar reasons, education embraces an acquaintance with Music, and the kindred arts which connect themselves most directly with the intelligence and common reason, through those most intellectual of the senses, the eye and the ear. Something more might be added, but we have here the outlines of what may be included under the term Liberal Education, as that spiritual culture which is for man as man, whatever may be his special distinctions of condition; and for every man, as far as this short and troubled and much occupied life may yield the means and furnish the motives for its attainment.

Such a scheme is built on what man is in himself—in his own inner world of being. It may be said to rest, too, on the nature of man in his most unchanging and universal relations to things within, beneath, above and around him. As thus growing

out of the human condition, it has heretofore, in all civilized communities, been recognized as presenting the prime elements and main outlines of true scholastic discipline. Hence most of these departments, thus viewed, have been styled "*the humanities*;" and the course combining them has been called Liberal Education—*παιδεία ἡλευθέριος*, as it was named by Aristotle. It is rightly so called, not merely as denoting the education of a freeman, which is one sense, but also as that which tends to *free* the soul from the selfish contracting influence of local, temporal, and partial associations as connected with local and partial pursuits. These, however useful, and even indispensable, do yet require some acquaintance with humane and liberal knowledge, as a corrective of that narrowness, and prejudice, and one-sidedness, which ever result from viewing things in confined and particular situations. It is also *liberal*, because it raises a man out of his low individuality, or individualism, into the freer life of humanity. It brings him into communion with the common educated mind of the race, as represented by that gathered knowledge of past ages which has ever survived the temporary, and which furnishes the only sure ground for the much talked of progress. It lifts him, we may say, out of the Spirit of the Age, which is sometimes a very narrow thing, into the Spirit of the Ages. It guards him against the delusions of the *vox populi*, by tuning his ear to hear, and his heart to understand, the *vox humanitatis*; that "still small voice," which ever remains as the onflowing residuum, after the froth and turbulence, the earthquake, fire and storm of each succeeding age have passed by. Ours, too, will add to that voice, to be heard by the ages that come after us, but in tones subdued, and sounding very differently, it may be, from the near clamor of it that is now ringing in our ears.

Of such a course of education it may be said that it gives a man a command, at pleasure, over much that lies beyond or below it. It places him in a position from which he can overlook the whole field of knowledge, and, any time, stoop down and make himself master of any of the partial or professional sciences whenever needed either as matters of utility or of curious

investigation. He has his foundation; he can build upon it what he pleases.

In fixing the practical outlines of such a scheme of education as may be called fundamental, the greatest difficulty is found in that expansion of physical science which has grown out of the discoveries of modern times. Whilst elsewhere the boundaries are well defined, here it is difficult to prescribe the limits, to separate the fundamental from the partial, the *humane* from what is merely professional, or to be regarded as belonging to particular pursuits. Former ages had less experience of this difficulty, because physical science was so limited. The Greeks had their *physics*; but it consisted of those general questions about nature, motion, force, causation, time and place, that many now would rather style *metaphysics*. What we now call by that name, or natural science in its detail, had hardly any existence among them. They thought more about the cosmology of the universe, than the classification of its parts. Hence what has since almost exclusively usurped the name of science *par excellence*, was hardly entitled to the appellation at all. *Scientia* (ἐπιστήμη) was thought to be correctly predicated only of those truths which were supposed to be fixed, necessary and eternal, the objects of the pure reason, and therefore alone capable of being surely known. The ever flowing phenomena of the material world, being referable to no necessary axioms, were only objects of sense and opinion; scattered facts, constituting *natural history* (the term employed by Aristotle), rather than *natural science*. We plainly see their error, but have gone to the opposite extreme. These things are science, but only so far as they are manifestations of the necessary and the universal, or connect themselves with what is ultimately demanded by the soul's own thinking. So far the old thinkers were right. The fault of our modern Baconian term is that it makes them science almost exclusively, and that too in their most outward and arbitrary aspects. Instead of its old names, *Grammatica, Musica, Rhetorica, Logica, Philosophia, Ethica, Politica, Geometrika, &c.*, the word science now calls up, in many minds, only the interminable list of the *ologies*, so liberal-

ly introduced into the modern vocabulary; a large portion of which, with all their euphonic titles, are after all but chapters and sections and subdivisions of what is still to be regarded as natural history. Nothing shows more strongly this aspect of very modern times, than the fact that we have dignified with the name of science (not a science, but science pre-eminently) Conchology and Helminthology, the knowledge of shells and worms; whilst Theology, once styled *Regina scientiarum*, is barely admitted, if not wholly tabooed as a mere wrangle about sprinklings and immersions and apostolical successions. If capability of classification, however, is the only test (and that is about as far as some things called science have gone), we may have a science of paving stones as well as of the heavenly bodies.

Our ancestors, doubtless, had views far too limited respecting the importance of the study of nature. We, however, are now running into a worse because a more fundamental error, in giving a preponderance to this physical department, so out of all proportion that it threatens to exclude knowledge more directly connected with the cultivation of the mind, and therefore of far more importance to us as beings destined to survive when the present nature sinks in years, and "like a changed garment" shall be laid aside for more glorious and eternal manifestations of that which can never change. What has been sketched as fundamental, should be regarded as indispensable. This should be preserved at all events in our colleges and higher seminaries. Other things, if there is time for them, or a place can be made for them; but this never to be superseded, if we would not risk the entire loss of the name and of the thing we call Liberal Education.

This part of our subject is full of difficulties. We would, however, venture to maintain, in the most general way, one or two principles on which a tolerably correct classification may be made, and the equilibrium of college education be essentially preserved. And first we say, natural knowledge may be divided into two main departments. One of these only is strictly entitled to the name *science*; the other may more properly be

called, as the ancients called it, *natural history*. However valuable for many purposes the latter may be, it is simply a collection of facts or phenomena, more or less partial, local or temporal, and classified mainly by phenomenal resemblances or differences. They may become scientific; but in their present state, whatever science they may seem to possess is only the application of principles drawn from other departments. We may safely say that a large portion of these must be shut out from a course of liberal education, even when planned upon the largest scale. There is no reason, to say the least, why the minutiae of Mineralogy and Ichthyology should be crowded into such a course, any more than the chronology or political history of the Esquimaux or the inhabitants of Australia.

It is, doubtless, well to have all the knowledge that can be obtained on these matters stored up somewhere in books or manuscripts, like specimens preserved in the cabinets of the curious, to be used when called for by some partial or professional purpose. Of course, then, some must make these departments their special study; and if so, they should pursue it with enthusiasm. It is well that in some books there should be thus stored away a particular knowledge of all the mosses, all the varieties of seaweed, all the various species of worms and animalcules—if there is any end to them, or if there is not; but it certainly can form no proper part of true scholastic culture, whether in the lower or the higher schools.

What is strictly natural science, presents a higher claim to a place among the *humanities*. Yet even here there is an obvious gradation, grounded on a very clear principle. Those branches of natural science are best entitled to a place in a scheme of liberal education which are the most universal in their phenomena, and most closely connected with the knowledge of the necessary and the eternal; of that which is true in itself as principle, rather than as mere exhibitions of facts or phenomenal law which is nothing more than an outward inductive classification from facts.

Some of these are almost purely science in this highest sense, what there is of them which is merely phenomenal, serving rather as diagrams of higher verities, than as being itself the know-

ledge most desired as an end. Thus Astronomy is entitled to a high place, as being almost purely mathematical, or an exhibition of the eternal verities of mathematical science on the grandest phenomenal scale, and in connection with those laws of motion that rank next to the geometrical axioms in respect to certainty, necessity and universality. It is not merely the magnitude of its phenomena; for there may be more science in a very minute object than in a very large one. There may be more science in a snow-flake than in a mountain. It is not bulk, then, but its connection with those higher truths, those eternal verities, that makes the grandeur of astronomical science. Jupiter, and the satellites of Jupiter, are very glorious objects; but that numerical and dynamical law, that thought of the Infinite Mind, which binds them together, hath "a far more exceeding glory."

On the same ground, Optics would have rank. Any one may see, too, how applicable the principle would be to Mechanics, or that whole science of force which has been styled Dynamics. So too the discoveries of Chemistry are bringing out, more and more, the same connections; and a like position may be taken in respect to the knowledge of those lately examined forces which are denominated Magnetism, Galvanism, and Electricity. The progress of discovery is more and more building out of them a science, not simply of classified phenomena as heretofore, but of those phenomena regarded as exhibitions of eternal, mathematical and dynamical laws.

We have thus some good grounds of discrimination in determining the place of natural science, and the gradations of its parts, in a course of liberal education; although some difficulties must ever remain in the application of the principles. Especially will this be the case in respect to those schools where there can be only time and means for the merest outlines of liberal culture; for we contend that the term *liberal* may apply to the common school as well as to the university. Here but few of the strictly physical sciences can come in. Others, we know, take a directly contrary position. Even in the most elementary schools they would assign the preponderance to

these branches, on the very plausible plea of their being more practical and immediately useful.

We do not intend to rail at utility. Still it may be doubted whether those who use the term most have always a clear idea of what they mean by it. There are different kinds, there are different degrees of utility. There may be also a mistake in regard to what some would style immediate practical results. Let us suppose for example, that in one of our academies, or in one of our better order of common schools, there are two classes pursuing two distinct courses of study. One is mainly devoted to grammar, either of our own or of some other tongue; to some plain system of logic, such as might easily be adapted even to the common school; to rhetoric, composition, the most instructive portions of history; to the daily reading of choice extracts from some of our most classical English authors; to moral philosophy, and some of the most fundamental branches of the pure mathematics. The other, under this common idea of the practical and immediately useful, is mainly occupied with chemistry, geology, mineralogy, botany, physiology, and some of the most practical branches of the mixed mathematics, such as engineering, surveying, etc., learned practically and without the theoretical. Both of these would be extreme. One compounded of the two, would be better than either exclusively. But can there be a rational doubt as to which course would, in the end, make the most practical man; best fit him for the common duties, and common trials of life; give him the largest view of his relations to mankind, the most of those ideas and of that thinking which pertains to our common humanity; or, in short, better prepare him for that work that belongs to man as man (beyond and beside all particular occupations), and which he was sent here by his Maker to perform? Which of these two courses would be most effectual towards producing that most *useful* result, a symmetrical mental character; or which, on the other hand, would be most likely to turn out a one-sided man, with a one-sided knowledge adapted, perhaps, though in a very limited degree, to partial and immediate purposes, yet, on this account, taking away from the mind's general power, and

distorting its general vision? When the question is thus stated, what thinking mind can hesitate in giving the only true answer?

We have supposed that the immediate practical results, in the latter case, do truly turn out to be such as were designed or expected; but this is far from being certain. Experience as a teacher has convinced the writer that on no studies is time generally wasted to so little purpose, as on those that are pursued in reference to immediate practical utility. There is something in the very nature of such a course leading to the neglect of theoretical knowledge, and, of course, the practical and empirical knowledge acquired is superficial and inaccurate. It is too limited for the purpose intended, and deficient in the requisite stimulus. Boys can never be made to study from such a motive of after utility. With young men in college, it is but a feeble incitement to close application. Nothing will do here until the soul is, somehow, awakened to the love of knowledge *per se*, and that demands, for the moment, forgetfulness of all things else. New discoveries, or new applications of them to the practical arts, are seldom made except by those who have a passionate fondness for the science involved in them, contemplated under its theoretical aspect. Notwithstanding what is said about the impulse given to scientific discovery since Bacon taught that utility was its grand aim (a thing by the way, that Bacon never did teach), it can be most abundantly shown that the largest additions of new and useful truths have been made by men who were the devoted lovers of science for its own sake, acting under the influence of this higher stimulus, and without a thought of utility. Science has thus ever been, and ever will be, most truly useful when regarded by its enthusiastic votaries as most purely theoretical; that is, most purely science. Its spirit will die out; it will be no longer useful, no longer practical; it will be effete and barren of new discoveries: progress will have come to a standstill, when false views of education have tended to make science wholly practical and utilitarian, in its moving aims as well as in its economical results. The history of scientific discovery would most abundantly prove this; paradoxical as it may appear.

Even here, too, there is a necessary gradation. There are two classes of scientific men: those in whom the theoretical is predominant, and even exclusive; and those who indeed love science for its own sake, but in whom the practical talent is the chief characteristic. The latter class is valuable; the first is indispensable. The men of pure science are the deep fountains of all utilities, high and low; the other class are the conduits by which they are diffused through practical life. The scientific *genius* of a Newton or a Davy must precede the practical *talent* of a Watt or a Stephenson, a Fulton or a Morse. Thus what proceeds from the sage in his closet or his laboratory—the offspring of pure mind abstracted from the world and all its utilities, and thinking only of science as science—becomes afterwards matter of practical application, and, being thus transmuted, passes into the common mind, and is added to the common stock of practical knowledge. We cannot change this course, this gradation that nature has established, by any hot-bed forcing process that would convert our colleges into machine shops, or chemical manufactories of gas. There is an amount of chemistry that belongs to the college, as a part of general knowledge which should be known by every educated man, and without which he cannot be said to be liberally educated. All beyond that, belongs to those who have an enthusiastic fondness for it, and mean to devote their lives to its pursuit. These will obtain their end, under the high stimulus aforesaid; but their number is necessarily very small. To make all educated men such, is an impossibility; whilst the amount of chemical knowledge rightly proportioned to a college course, though it may stimulate some to a farther and more devoted pursuit of this noble science, is, in itself, and from the very necessity of the case, too general for immediate practical results.

But could they be easily and universally acquired, are these practical studies really as useful, even for the ordinary life, as some that for their sake would be thrown out of our schools? Take chemistry again, the best of them all: it is the one most frequently cited by our practical men. Its applications to the arts and manufactures are enlarged upon. Illustrations are

given. It helps us to analyze bad brandy; it enables us to detect the deceptions of quacks; it discovers poisons that may be lying in our food. What can be more useful than this? Logic, on the other hand, is regarded by very many as comparatively useless. It is merely the knowledge of words, say they, and of scholastic trifles. No man at present employs logic to discover truth; the laboratory and the crucible are now employed for that purpose. Since Bacon's time, says every itinerant lecturer, we interrogate nature, instead, of trifling with syllogisms. Now no thinking man would maintain that the office of logic was the direct discovery of truth; but it is certainly of highest value as a detector of the false in speech and thought, even as chemistry is a detector of the false in nature. Our age, it is true, abounds in quacks in the common usage of the term; and there is, therefore, great value in that noble science which enables us to detect their colorless nostrums. But are there not quacks and quackeries political, quacks theological, quacks social, quacks literary, quacks editorial? Their quackeries meet us in speeches from our legislative halls; in the resolutions, false or meaningless, of public meetings. They abound in the newspapers, in public lectures; they pour as legions from the teeming press. Instead of bad brandy, then, let us take for analysis some public speech by which the mind of the hearers may have been greatly swayed. It swarms in fallacies. It abounds, not simply in misrepresentations, but in gross errors of reasoning, arising either from ignorance or design. But these fallacies are dispersed through many columns; they float concealed in a colorless solvent holding in solution almost every sophism of thought and language. The premises are very far from the conclusion, and between them intervenes a deluding mass of declamation; both causes prevent that detection of the main sophism which would, at once, arise from bringing them into immediate contiguity, as is the office of the syllogism to do. The middle term, whose soundness is the conservative element of the whole reasoning, is used in various senses, or it has more meaning in one place than in another, so that in fact there are several middle terms, and several argu-

ments wrapped in one; but these various senses are far apart; one is lost sight of before the other is reached, or it is obscured by the intervening matter which the blundering of the speaker, or the misled fancy of the hearer, has introduced. In this way, a most false conclusion is palmed upon us as following from the most indisputable premises. This is especially the case when the speaker makes much show of a false logical lingo, abounds in "wherefores" and "therefores," talks much about his "premises," tells us continually that "it follows" so and so, when nothing follows but a string of non-sequiturs from end to end. This was the style, not so much declamatory as pretentiously logical, by which Calhoun juggled his hearers, and got with many the name of the great logician. Such truly *was* his eminent Northern rival, who had too much sound logic to introduce into his speeches that technical logical language which belongs, not to the orator, but to the critical analyst of his discourse.

In perusing such a speech as we have described, the reader often feels that there is a gross fallacy somewhere, but he is unable to lay his finger upon it; or he may be wholly carried away by disguised sophistry. Now how important the knowledge, or rather the mental discipline, which enables us to bring such a pretended argument into its true syllogistic form, to reduce every word to its precise sense, to bring every proposition to its true place in relation to every other, to strip off all its irreverent patchwork, to bind together into one near view the widely dispersed assertions that enter into its middle term (or terms), to detect by such contiguity its disguised or double senses, to bring by such a marshalling the premises face to face with the conclusion, and thus to precipitate at once the poisonous error before diffused through this deceptive compound, and as readily too as the chemical test precipitates the poisonous ingredient in the quack's health-destroying nostrum. There is such a science; there is such an art: for it is both a science and an art. It should be taught early and thoroughly in our schools. A man may forget its rules, its technical language may be lost; but the discipline of mind it hath given, the critical analyzing faculty, these remain and enable him to perform

for himself, and for others, this office never more needed than at the present day.

In view of every aspect of things around us, who can over-estimate the immense *practical utility* of having the common mind everywhere accustomed to some degree of logical analysis, to strict verbal definition, and to a detection of those fallacies that result from that most common offence, the gross abuse of language? And yet very many, even of those claiming to be educational authorities among us, would rank it among the comparatively useless branches. The present age, say they, is pre-eminently practical: it demands the knowledge of *things*; the world has long enough been occupied with *words*. It demands useful knowledge, as distinguished from useless logical or verbal investigations, or, as they would contemptuously style it, the subtleties of the schools. A melancholy experience of errors, social, moral, and religious, may yet convince us that *words* are very important *things*; and that the analysis of words and propositions may be far more useful and practical, at certain times, than that of earths and alkalis. He who should reduce to their elemental ideas, and thus clearly define, such words as nature, supernatural, law, development, idea, life, organic, power, force, faculty, government, state, church, morality, religion, duty, crime, punishment, reformation, liberty, will, necessity, cause, effect, reason, motive, right as an adjective, right as a noun, with many other similar words that now pass about like defaced and worn-out coins; he who would stamp them all anew, and so bring out their true and ancient image, the same and immutable under all abuse, making them so clear to the popular mind that every counterfeit would be instantly detected, and all false traffic in this precious currency rendered an impossibility; such a man, we say, would confer a favor upon our age of more value than the most splendid discoveries of modern science.

The progress in physical knowledge fills up that department in the general scheme of education, in which former ages were so deficient. Still the limited time allotted to our primary schools requires that there should be a limited selection, cor-

responding best to that governing idea which has been presented of the proper culture of the mind. Instead, then, of the present rage for the physical sciences, to the exclusion of almost everything else; instead of smatterings of botany and mineralogy; instead of "child's books on physiology," having just enough to make them the dupes of every quackish lecturer who chooses to adopt a scientific jargon, and accounts for every thing by electricity; instead of this, or along with some of this if it must be so, let history and language and logic, and some of the plainer branches of the pure mathematics, have a space bearing some proportion to their importance, even in our common schools. Let English grammar, accompanied with the analysis of words in our own language, be studied long and thoroughly. Let a considerable portion of the time devoted to common school education be occupied with the daily reading and critical study of selections from our most choice English classics. If the poor man's child must remain ignorant of some branches of physical science, or know nothing of Shakespeare and Milton, by all means let the first be sacrificed. Let something be done, during this brief period, for even the most lowly, towards elevating their thoughts and tastes above the hard practical drudgeries with which they will become familiar enough in after life. If it be, indeed, but a very short time they can devote to knowledge, let that knowledge be of the purest kind, knowledge most intimately connected with the soul and its noblest tastes, knowledge that shall enter into the spiritual life, and be the spirit's remembered solace amid the depressing toils of after days. A precious season this, the very few years of the poor child's schooling! Let us see to it that it be filled with what is most precious in thought, and in its after power upon the soul. Let us not, under the pretence of what we call "immediate practical utility," be so cruel as to give them, for their daily reading books, miserably composed works on the ordinary economies of life, or selections from town laws or from revised statutes that hardly last some half dozen of years until they are revised again; or newspapers, as some would recommend; or such quackish things as Combe's Constitution of

Man, instead of the choicest extracts from Addison and Blair and Johnson and Milton, from Burke and Beattie, Pope and Goldsmith; from Spenser, Cowper, Thomson, Young; from Coleridge, Scott and Burns: books from which thousands, even in humblest life, have received elevation of taste, purity of conception, command of language, appreciation of sound reasoning; a *feeling*, at least, of the power that is in well-chosen words even if there was not received all the rich fullness of that import which they carry to minds of higher cultivation. Children do not understand such books, it is said: let the teacher then patiently fill up the mind's vacancy. But they do understand more than we think. There is a spirit in good words that will not lie dormant: they will quicken the spirit into which they enter, even without outward instruction; they will be *felt*, at least as something rich and excellent; they will beget a taste to meet their excellence; and especially will they, in after life, come up again, and bring with them a new life, a new impress to the faded forms that had long years ago been planted in the memory. Give them children's books, if we would ever keep them children; give them what are called practical books, or business books, if we would ever keep their souls in the same poor barren state to which poverty or toil condemns their outward lives. But it would be better to imitate the wise and truly practical Greeks in this thing, and especially in the method by which was imparted to their youth so much of their peculiar national character. Let it be a standing practice in our common schools to commit to memory choice portions from our best writers, and especially from the poets, as being that which will lie nearest to the heart and deepest in the remembrance. Much is said in sermons, and in lectures, against the bad influence of what is called the light and corrupt literature of the day. If we would keep this out, let the soul be preoccupied with something better. The young man, or woman, whose mind has been deeply, if not extensively, affected by the ideas and language of the authors just mentioned, will have little relish for much of the quackery and trash now everywhere streaming from the press.

These remarks apply with still greater force to colleges. There have sprung up of late, in almost all our higher seminaries, what are called partial courses. They are favored as most popular, most practical, and most immediately connected with the business of after life. They generally embrace, in largest proportion, the physical sciences, to the neglect of other departments belonging to the essential idea of liberal education. Now it may be a serious question whether they secure, to any desirable extent, even the poor and partial end at which they aim, and for which so much that is fundamental has to be sacrificed. Permit the writer to give his own thirty years' experience as a teacher here. It is decidedly to the effect, that college students on a partial course of this kind are not, in general, so well acquainted even with their own chosen branches, as those who have connected with them other studies deemed fundamental in a general course. There has been obtained a more solid acquaintance even with natural science and the mixed mathematics, and especially a better appreciation of those aspects that connect them with the whole field of knowledge, by young men who have been steadily pursuing, at the same time, the old course of classical, philosophical, and pure mathematical study. Here, also, may there be presented to our practical men the same test as before, and on their own vaunted ground of practical utility. Let the experiment be fairly tried with a dozen young men drilled for four years, mainly, in the philological, the logical, the moral, the metaphysical, the historical and mathematical sciences, together with what is generally known as the *belles-lettres*. Let the same number, during the same period, be occupied with those physical branches that have usurped to themselves, almost exclusively, the names of the scientific and the practical. With the utmost confidence would we abide the resulting test that would settle the question, which of the two courses proposed would turn out the most truly practical men, most efficient, best qualified to act their parts among men in all the moral, social and political relations of life.

A person once told me, by way of derision, that the course of studies in Trinity College, Dublin, was nothing but a round

of Greek, Geometry and Logic, and Geometry, Logic and Greek, and Logic, Greek and Geometry. This was, of course, a caricature; and yet if these prime studies denoted a well-proportioned course in those departments of the classical, the mathematical and the philosophical, of which they might be taken as the representatives, it was admirably adapted to produce a strong man among men, even though he may have had a very limited knowledge of the details of physical science. We know that there are strong men who have been made otherwise; and that there are weak men, far too many, who have been sent from our colleges. Horace Greeley is a specimen of the first kind; but even he would admit, we think, that he has grown stronger, and less one-sided, in proportion as he has given himself, in his reading, to this general culture. Knowing his own strength, he may with some reason feel proud of his superiority to many who are said to be liberally educated; but the number of those to whom he can thus point would, doubtless, have been much less, had our colleges rigidly adhered to the old scholastic method, instead of breaking up their strength in these partial and purely physical courses. Chemistry and Zoology would never have made the Editor of the Tribune. And so we may say of Franklin, that though electricity, as an incidental pursuit, added to his fame, it neither made his mental strength, nor formed an essential part of his mental culture. It was his study of the humanities, his close reading of the best English literature, the persevering pains he took to form his own excellent style by writing over the choicest papers of Addison, that made a man who was by nature strong still stronger in that power of thought and clear expression which gave him such a command over other minds.

But would you exclude instruction in partial sciences, for partial and professional pursuits? By no means. Let every one get all the knowledge and skill he can according to his opportunities, and in every way he can that will not interfere with the acquisition of that which is fundamental. All that is meant is that these things do not come under the general idea of Liberal Education. They belong to the training or vocation

of the individual in his individuality; and for their better acquisition, if necessary, let special institutions and apparatus be provided. The State, too, may encourage them as it encourages farriery or the making of chemicals, or any kind of useful manufacture. But we protest against unsettling an established idea, and introducing into a long established word a license of meaning to which, when once begun, we can affix no limit.

The amount of it all is this: We must be men, and know what pertains to men as men, however limited and rudimentary the knowledge, before we are merchants or mechanics or farmers. According to this view, the college should be the expansion of the common school, only presenting the same idea under a higher and wider aspect. What we have styled the humanities should be the main teaching in both, although in the latter they may exist in their most rudimentary state. The wide university course of pure mathematics, for example, has as its representative in these primary departments, the study of numbers, with such advance in algebra and geometry as time will allow. Here too, the theoretical should be primary, if it were only to secure the soundest practical. Arithmetic will be useful to the boy, of course; but its utilities in keeping accounts and making money should not be incessantly dinned into his ears. Let him have the charm of pure knowledge, the delight of pure wonder as the wide unknown is opening before him. Tell him that in these prime properties of numbers which are now unfolding themselves to his mind, or rather *within* his mind, there are contained the seeds of infinite truths; and thus give him the highest and purest stimulus, though faint perhaps his grasp of what you mean. To proceed with our parallel: Mental Philosophy, Moral Philosophy and Theology, as taught in the humbler school, may be represented in the Bible, the Catechism, and such well selected reading lessons as, along with excellence of style, should impart some knowledge of our wondrous human nature, in connection with those mysteries of our being that come to the mind of the musing child—oftener, it may be, than to the hard and worldly man. Philology should be represented by the study of the grammar of our own tongue. The scien-

tific Logic of the higher schools might here exist in the form of an accurate analysis of all our more usual moral, political, and theological terms. The Rhetoric and Belles-lettres of the University might have their typical rudiments in the practice, before mentioned, of committing to memory select stores from our most classical prose writers and poets. The universal history of the one might be the epitome of the other. And thus, if we might bring in some of the most instructive lessons from nature in their most universal aspects, the common school becomes the rudimentary college, looking to the same end, and the same idea of universal, humane, or liberal education.

One aspect of professional study may, perhaps, be entitled to exception from the foregoing conclusions. What are styled "the learned professions," namely, of Law, Medicine, and Theology, were in former times regarded as part of the general culture of the mind (and thus far liberal), rather than as ministerial or strictly professional. This latter aspect seems now to have become predominant; and yet, even as studies peculiar to distinct callings, they have more connection with general knowledge, more to do with man as man, or with humanity in its most universal estimate, than other seemingly partial pursuits. They embrace the three widest relations: of man to his Maker; of man to his fellow-men; of man to the world of matter, through his own material organization. The knowledge, therefore, peculiar to them runs through the three grand departments of political, religious, and natural philosophy. Hence there is, in the very nature of things, a ground for the distinction and preëminence which have given them this long established title of "the learned and liberal professions." They had, too, this name of liberal, because, until near our own times, the requital for their services was regarded as coming from the voluntary sense of honor, rather than from any stipulation of price or fee. The attorney might have his taxable costs, the Apothecary his bill of items; but the learned Counsellor, and the learned Physician, never sold knowledge. However liberal the donations received, they were supposed to be a grateful testimonial for benefits whose value could not be estimated in

money. Times have changed in this respect, yet still do these professions hold their place above others. Long may they be protected from the influence of that degrading view, which, as held even by some professedly within their own pale, would actually make them mere trades, instead of elevated and honorable offices connected with the highest responsibilities. There is reason to fear this, from the growing tendency to divest them of all science, and thus reduce them to the merest empiricisms. When this is effected, they become the narrowest and the meanest of all pursuits, simply because in that state they are base counterfeits of the highest and noblest knowledge.

What is the relation, now, of education and the educated man to the State? The answer to this question will be determined by the view we take of the civil organism, or our answer to those other questions, What is the State itself; and what are its legitimate powers? In relation to our present subject, the latter inquiry presents itself under two aspects: 1. Can the State educate at all? 2. Can the State properly give aid to any other than the common primary schools? In other words, Can it rightly aid institutions designed to furnish an education which, in the very nature of things, cannot be had by all? The affirmative of the first question is, at present, assumed without discussion. The answer to the second depends on the still further inquiry, What is the object of education? Is the man educated for himself alone, or for the good of the organic body of which he is a member? If for himself, then, as far as public aid is concerned, there would be some reason in the assertion of equal individual rights, and in the cry—all or none. In determining this we must aim at having right views, first of the nature of education; and, secondly, of the relation which the man, whether partially or liberally educated, bears to the commonwealth, or common weal. The first has been already discussed, and it is easy to see with what view of the State it connects itself. So also that notion of education which regards each man as educated for himself, draws with it a peculiar theory of the civic *whole*, and of the relations of its parts. The *mass*, we should rather say; for this view regards

the State, not as a whole, properly, whose members by their harmonious relations to the social unity are, at the same time, "members one of another," but rather as a collection of separate interests, brought together by the pressure of circumstances; like forces held in contiguity by an outside mechanical constraint, rather than an inward all-pervading life. It is the Hobbean theory of society as a dissocial peace, or rather armed armistice; a Babel of jarring pursuits, with an ever restless jealousy of partial privileges, a never-ceasing apprehension of rights invaded, a tormenting fear of monsters whom one portion are ever employing to devour the liberties of others.

In preserving such a forced equilibrium, the grand aim is ever to array class against class, the poor against the rich, the farmer against the merchant, the country against the city, the laborer against the capitalist, the uneducated against the educated. There is manifested a dislike to all professions which, in consequence of requiring a higher and a rarer knowledge, do necessarily elevate those who are engaged in them somewhat above other portions of the community. Hence the hostility to the bar, at least in the higher and now almost obsolete sense of a cultivated class of men who devote themselves to the law for its "excellent learning," as a quaint old lawyer calls it. In the wake of this comes opposition to the bench, as a grave, and learned, and permanent body. Hence, too, a dislike of the more scientific medical practice. It is an all-pervading spirit of distrust and suspicion. It has no idea of the State as an organic body, in which the members have their value, and their truest individual well-being in their proper relation to the whole; where whatever is high is for the elevation of the whole, and whatever is strong is for the stability of the whole, and whatever is most sound is for the health of the whole, and whatever is most learned is for the enlightenment of the whole.

It is from this idea of the State as a *mass* made up of masses, where each part is for itself, comes this talk about rights, and the favoring of the few at the expense of the many. Those who are governed by it cannot think of higher and

lower, or of degrees in education, without the thought of degradation and injustice. They cannot understand how a superiority in a *part* may be for the highest good of the *whole*, and even of the inferior portion itself, so as actually to be the necessary antecedent to its elevation. They cannot understand how there can be an education which, although of individuals, in whatever way selected, is yet for the State, and may therefore be truly said to be an education of the State, or, in this sense, an education of all. In other words, they cannot conceive of a knowledge which is for the whole, and therefore of the whole, and from which, as from a common treasury most availably deposited in certain individual minds, the mental and moral health of the whole may be better conserved, than by any unavailing efforts to make such an absolute equalization as nature, and the God of nature in His wisdom and benevolence to mankind, never intended should exist.

Put all this into its proper language, and it reads thus: Unless all men can be lawyers, there shall be no State-patronized means for securing any special qualifications in this respect; in other words, there shall be no lawyers, of course no bench, and even no law worthy of the name. Unless every empiricism that does not even dare to call itself science, has equal patronage, there shall be no public encouragement given to the teaching of that medical system which builds carefully on the slow inductions of ages, and which, therefore, with its imperfections, is the only one that a man can rationally trust. But no, say they, there must be no discrimination; the moment it is made, you trample on somebody's rights. We see here what an evil may come from an error in logic, or even in grammar, we might say. Few things have done more mischief in the world, than this substitution of the noun "*right*" (the individual claim to have what any one else has) for the adjective "*right*," or that which is *right* in itself, as being the best thing for the general good. The public funds must not be given at all, or they must be given to all alike: to every quack who vends a pill, to every juggling professor of clairvoyance, to every empirical dealer in roots; for have they not all their rights—

each one the same right to sell his short individual experience, as that other man whose "book-learning," as they call it, is simply the gathered inductive experience of the centuries since the days of Hippocrates?

Utterly different is the idea of that coherent organism where nothing is regarded as designed for itself alone; and where, of course, when *fully* realized (which we admit is never done in this imperfect world), there can be no selfish jealousy in respect to individual rights; where variety is admitted, not as inferiority, but as the only condition on which there can be true cohering unity; and where there is found, in the well-tempered relations of parts and interdependence of rights, its strength, its consistence, and, as a necessary consequence, its highest well-being. That master limner, Aristotle, has well sketched the opposite view, and drawn its character at a stroke. "It is," says he, speaking of some in his day who would make society a stagnant level of individual rights; it is as though an ignorant musician should reduce a symphony to a flat and tuneless homophony, or attempt to construct a rhythm from syllables all of the same tone and quantity." Each tone, each syllable, would have its right; but what wretched music would be the result!

A kindred fallacy may be detected in that word which some are so fond of using—"the people." They employ it, not as denoting collectively all the members and departments of which the body politic is composed, but some imaginary interest different from all the varied classes, pursuits, and professions. Lawyers are not "people"; neither are physicians, nor clergymen. The rich are not people; nor landlords; nor, in fact, any who own more of the soil than others. So also judges are not people, nor legislators. In the same way would they regard men of education, and all who are specially devoted to learning, science, or literature. All these, and many more, form classes distinct from the people. They stand by themselves; and the people are to keep watch of them with the utmost jealousy, as possessing adverse interests, as their oppress-

ors, their enemies, ever ready to destroy their rights and liberties.

Inequalities of condition are not inequalities of right, in the true sense of the term. In monarchical or aristocratical states, there is danger of such differences becoming personally fixed and permanent; in which case they are a disease in the body politic, tending to rigidity and death. They become real "privileged classes." Hence what is the sheerest demagoguism here, may be sound patriotism, and sound philanthropy, in political organisms so differently constituted. It requires but little observation to see that with us there can be nothing fixed in these distinctions of occupation and pursuit. Their continual flowing is, at the same time, a cause and an effect of political health. Those who at one period have a position in any way raised above the common level are ever—either themselves or their near posterity—falling into and blending with the mass, whilst others are every moment taking their places. It is the inequality of the fresh moving wave, not of the rigid death-bound iceberg. The healthy diversities are constant; the individual parts are ever flowing. There is ever height, and ever lowliness; yet nothing to prevent the one from falling, nothing that can say to the other, thou shalt not rise. And this may be called the very soul of the body politic. The living *form* remains; the *matter* is ever changing. Thus it is that in our happily tempered institutions, classes and varieties and ideas essential to the general coherence and organic well-being may maintain a healthy permanence, resisting the tendency to an utter democratic fluidity on the one hand, and to an entailed aristocratic rigidity on the other; yet still the waters of life flow on; the individual parts ever rising and sinking, now on the topmost swell, and again descending, waning, disappearing, until lost in the lowest strata of society:—

ut unda impellitur unda,
Tempora sic fugiunt pariter, pariterque sequuntur,
Et nova sunt semper.

As wave by wave is driven on, so pass
The flowing times; forever still the same,
And yet forever new.

So that the children of the present wealthy may be among the poorest of a following generation ; and the descendants of those who are now called the learned, may receive, as their highest education, the instructions of the lowest common school.

It is a favorite position with some, that all educational appropriations should be for the education of "the people," in their imaginary use of the term. They will talk of the common schools as the people's schools, and contend that to them alone the legislature should extend its aid. They alone are for the community ; the others for separate interests. Now we maintain that academies and colleges are for the people, as much as the common schools. They are for all in the highest sense, on the ground that their benefits do mediately and ultimately reach all classes. In whatever free community—and we mean by this one in which the healthy flow above mentioned is unimpeded—the colleges and academies are well sustained, made what they ought to be, there the common school flourishes of course. In whatever towns and counties of our State the influence of these higher institutions is most felt, or in other words in whatever places there reside the greatest number of men liberally educated, such as lawyers who have indeed made law a science, and learned clergymen, and scientific physicians ; or unprofessional persons of liberal culture, *there* will there be a superior order of common schools. Where this is not the case, money lavished upon them by the State is about thrown away.

But, again, these higher institutions are for all, in another sense, than that of mediate influence. They are for all in the universality of the offer. Their benefits are offered to all, on the lowest possible terms that will require the division of labor necessarily demanded for the higher instruction. But the poor, it may be said, cannot afford this expense ; and, therefore, they are as much shut out as though they had been expressly prohibited. How, then, it may well be asked, are they to be made accessible to greater numbers, and to those of scantier means ? There is but one answer to this. It must be by the bounty of the rich, or by legislative aid. Does any one imagine that any

college in this State is making dividends? In such a state of things, then, the public bounty enables them to reduce their average charges, or maintain them at a rate which will render the benefit accessible to a greater number. If even with this it cannot be extended to all, is that a reason why it should not be placed within the reach of as great a number as possible? Did demagoguism, then, ever before so stultify itself, as when it characterized such grants as taking money from the poor to give it to the rich? It is this simple principle, too, that gives us a safe legislative rule in determining the judiciousness of each grant. If such appropriation will enable a college to make a *pro rata* reduction of its charges, then *give*: if it will only go to relieve prior embarrassments, or to pay debts which never should have been contracted—then *withhold*.

But even with such aid, and to the extent too of making full pecuniary provision for the highest education of every child included in the census, can all be thus educated? This is the practical question for practical men. Common sense, and a common knowledge of mankind, at once answer in the negative. There are many other impediments beside the want of money. Only a minor portion can ever, under present circumstances, as we find them in this brief busy existence of ours, be instructed, to any available purpose, in the higher departments of learning and science. Thousands have not the capacity—no place for holding this precious treasure; thousands have not the time; thousands have not the inclination; thousands who have the pecuniary means, prefer the acquisition of wealth and pleasure; and many thousands must, from the very structure of society, be engaged in pursuits, most useful and therefore most honorable, yet wholly inconsistent with that devotion of time which any respectable attainments in science demand. Let education, therefore, be free in the freest sense; let the doors of our institutions be thrown open to the widest extent; let there be even agents and runners sent forth into the highways and byways, to urge them to come in: still we doubt if the halls of science would be filled to overflowing. A very large portion of mankind—sad as we think it—must, and ever

will, receive the benefits of learning, science, and philosophy, mediately through others, who, according to the truest idea of education, are educated, not for themselves, but for that well-harmonized body of which, in the good providence of God, and in a most important sense, they become the seeing, reflecting, and reasoning members—the eye, the ear, the brain, to guide the energies of the hands.

A portion educated for the sake of the many! All this, it may be said, is at war with “the genius of our institutions,” to use a favorite phrase. If this be so, then is it all the worse for “the genius of our institutions.” We must repeat it: there is need of such a class of well-cultivated minds, to prevent knowledge from becoming superficial in its tendency to popularization, and thus to make it actually more available to practical ends and the practical well-being of society, than could be done by any futile attempts to impart the same knowledge, as a *right*, to all. None have a deeper interest in the true view of this matter, than those whom the demagogue is so fond of styling “the people”; or, in other words, the great body of those whom the common and indispensable vocations of life necessarily exclude from the more difficult departments of knowledge. Should the anti-college feeling ever become predominant, none would, eventually, be greater sufferers by its vandalism, than those very classes whose jealousies it so studiously attempts to excite.

The practical questions, then, for practical men, we say again, are these: 1. Can all, or a majority, or even a fair minority of men, give that attention to science and philosophy which are demanded for them, in order to be available for any important ends? 2. Is there any other probable way of truly elevating and enlightening the masses,* except through the influence of those who, at any one time, constitute the liberal-

* We have used the word *masses* several times in this discourse, but it has been in deference to the common language. We exceedingly dislike the word, as a low one to apply to human beings, and as coming from that false view of the State as a mere gathering of individuals. *Members* and *membership* would be the terms demanded by the other idea of the State as an organic body.

ly educated class? The number of these will doubtless increase with the advance of society; but it is their influence which must contribute to swell their own numbers (thus ever creating both the demand and the supply), whilst, in so doing, it tends in the same ratio to elevate all below it.

This increase and elevation, arising from the steady action and reaction aforesaid, may go on, until, perhaps, in some future golden age, the body politic may have become all eye, all ear, all mind, with hand and feet, and every inferior member, forever dispensed with; constituting a period of intellectual glory, when men will have nothing to do but to think, and hold high debate on all imaginable questions; but it certainly is not so now, and will not be so, perhaps, for many generations to come. The bodily wants require too much attention. The physical world is yet so hostile, and man so morally depraved, that certain physical and social duties must yet occupy no small portion of this troubled season of probation. But could it be attained on earth, and in the body, it might even then be doubted whether for us, as still mortal and evil, such a universal *lumen siccum*, or "dry light," instead of being the highest good, would not rather tend to turn away the soul from the appreciation of that which is far above knowledge, and which, whilst accessible to all, as much transcends the merely intellectual, as the latter rises above the animal enjoyments of our nature.

But this is taking us out of our course. Whatever may be the future state of things, it is, certainly, among us, at the present day, highly desirable that many more should be liberally and thoroughly educated, than now enjoy that blessing. There are, and have been, "practical men" in plenty. "By their fruits we know them." It is not venturing much to say that a few more bookworms, and pedants even, would do the State no harm. We need more thinking men to mix, here and there, with the clamorous crowd of the practical. Or, to sum it all up, we need a more numerous class of persons learned, philosophical, and made familiar with those prime truths, which, although as old as philosophy, require a special exam-

ination in every age ; because they are the very ones, in assailing which, the superficial agitator exhibits his individualizing spirit. It requires the simplicity and common sense of thorough learning, to resist successfully this quackery, claiming to be so new and so transcendental. So, too, the true scholar, notwithstanding he may be sometimes charged as having an unsocial spirit, has, after all, more feeling with and for "the masses," than those who would assume their exclusive guardianship. The reason is, that the more thorough and liberal a man's education, the more he is drawn out of himself, or out of his individualism, into a community of thought and feeling with the sober reasoning humanity of all ages. As this was the leading idea with which our article commenced, there is no one better adapted to its close. "No man liveth for himself." The Apostle's maxim has its highest realization in the Church. It may also be taken as the life principle of all true human society, and hence the ground of all liberal education.

ART. II.—IMAGE AND LIKENESS.

BY REV. C. E. WEISER, A. M.

THE commentator, minister and catechist, together with the diligent student and devout reader of the Mosaic record of the creation of Man, find themselves in a *dilemma*, in acquiescing either in the oneness or duality of the terms—"image" and "likeness."

To maintain that they are identical, is to convict the inspired narrative of a tautology, in no wise complimentary; whilst, to endeavor to discover their essential difference, may prove a task, easy enough for the metaphysician, who sometimes seems to delight in uttering a saying which neither he nor others can understand, but is attended with no little difficulty for the pivot-man, who would instruct the simple and edify himself.

Even the controverting of both views, and the choosing of a

middle way, by which the term "likeness" is taken as merely *explanatory* of "image," does not conduct us so smoothly into the domain of clear conviction, after all, since, according to the Septuagint and Vulgate, at least, the troublesome little particle, "*and*," intervenes. It is no little annoying, indeed, to find acknowledged authorities either ignoring the *hiatus*, or bridging it over after such trestle-work style, as to awaken at once an elephantine timidity in the inquirer, lest the flimsy structure might not bear either his or its weight.

It is as well, perhaps, to have the two accepted Readings before us:

King James's Version: LET US MAKE MAN IN OUR IMAGE, AFTER OUR LIKENESS.

The Vulgate rendering: LET US MAKE MAN TO OUR IMAGE AND LIKENESS.

That the true sense of the Divine saying has continued in a sort of ecclesiastical Chancery, from the earliest age of the Christian Church, at all events, until now, after the manner of the famous *Homo-ousian* and *Homoi-ousian*, during the fourth century, will readily appear from a survey of the historical chain of comment wound around it, and which we purpose to uncoil. Nor do we think ourselves open to the charge of dragging the channel of but a shallow and pearl-less stream, at best, since all Christian teachers cannot but feel some concern for the actual depth and compass of man's peculiar prerogative—created in the image and likeness of God.

Commencing with the inspired Word itself, as the most ancient and sole archives of his origin, it is only necessary to remark, that the manner in which the history of his creation is related, and subsequently referred to in the Pentateuch, together with the later occasional allusions made by Prophet, Psalmist and Evangelist, all indicate something peculiar and eminent in the being formed. We look in vain, however, for anything marked, beyond a reciting of the factors which combined in the formation of his God-built constitution—"dust" and "the breath of life." The former element, with the latter breathed over and into it, resulted in the wonderful product—

"a living soul"—MAN, in the image and likeness of his Maker. In reference to what we may call the chemistry of his natural and moral constitution, the Divine Record is wholly silent. It is only as we advance downward, and away from the period in which the last of the inspired Writers closed the Book, that we find any attempt made to construct a Christian anthropology, embracing the science of man's nature in reference to the "image" and "likeness" of God, as residing either here or there, or throughout his whole being.

The *post*-Apostolic teachers only, do we find to venture upon this problem. But as even their courage waxeth bold, as it were, in proportion as they stand away from the primitive period of Revelation, the Apostolical Fathers may be regarded as timid and as cautious as their immediate predecessors had been. It is only from a very faint hinting at a possible anthropomorphism, that anything may be gathered from them on the subject. We are therefore obliged to move a little further onward still, in order to an intelligent prosecution of our investigation.

Justin Martyr, in the former half of the second century, dwells on the Divine image in man, and extends it both to his soul and body, without, however, informing us, what portion of his being the "image" is to be considered as covering, on the one hand, and the "likeness," on the other. He thinks it derogatory both to God and man, to exclude the body of man from all claim to a divine resemblance, since the fleshly framework had surely been fashioned after its great exemplar. If we are to conceive of God under a form at all, it was natural for those early teachers, as well as for others, to apply the *human*, since it is not possible for man to imagine any one more exalted and noble than his own. The early Fathers indulged the pleasing fancy, that the soul of man served as a model for his body, even as the Divine Archetype served as a pattern for his soul, thus rendering them severally, as it were, first and second transcripts. The same general thought is found expressed in a Homily of *St. Clement*, with but few varying features. In a later period *St. Methodius* brings it out to the full, and zealously exclaims in opposition to Origen:

"What are we to think of such a fate, as to be robbed of our God-like form, and to come forth in the Resurrection without hands and feet!"

Tatian, towards the latter half of the second century, in his "Oration against the Greeks," which had been written prior to his fall and separation from the Church, remarks, that the image of God in man is to be found in his destination for immortality, which prerogative the Spirit of God imparts to the whole man, in and through his spiritual nature, as an organ, but which sin can neutralize, and render him accordingly mortal. Still, this deprivation is not to be considered as accomplished with such disaster as to preclude every possibility of a subsequent restoration of the same.

Nevertheless, neither Justin Martyr nor *Tatian* venture on any distinction between *image* and *likeness*, nor afford us any severally defined portions in the constitution of man, to which both the one and the other is to be separately applied.

Ireneus, however, approached the subject boldly, and draws a marked line between man's physical and spiritual natures, applying the "image" of God to the former, and the "likeness" of God to the latter. Writing against the Heretics, he tells us that our fleshly contour, or body, is fashioned after God as its archetype, and embodies in itself the Divine image, whilst our moral apartment, in which are lodged Reason and Will, by which we are enabled to discern and elect the good, constitutes the basis on which the Divine likeness is to be perfected. *Ireneus* then, first introduces us to the *distinction* which is to be observed between the image of God, on the one hand, and the likeness of God, on the other, which continues henceforth to hold its place through all subsequent periods of the Church, in a more or less prominent way, though not always under the same form. The Alexandrian Fathers and Teachers, more especially, take pains constantly to preserve it. It is to be regretted that *Ireneus* is charged with not remaining consistent with himself, in reference to his original defining of the likeness of God in man, since he speaks of it as having been lost in consequence of sin, and restored again in Christ, *i. e.*, Im-

mortality. The circumstance, even if taken for granted, does yet not interfere in the least with our present aim, as we are more concerned to establish the distinction itself, from the records of ecclesiastical history, than to maintain and defend the consistency of its advocates throughout all succeeding epochs.

Tertullian argues, that man is not fashioned after God, so far as it pertains to the lineaments of his body, since the Creator preserves for Himself an unvarying form (*secundum uniformem Deum*), but in reference to His substance solely, which resembles His character, and is endowed with freedom. Withal, in another passage he distinguishes between "image" and "likeness," almost in the same words with *Ireneus*. He believes man to be restored again to the likeness of God through Baptism, in the image of Whom he had been originally created. The image is to be sought for in his outward form, whilst the Divine likeness is made to consist in his capacity for Eternal Salvation. Thus, if we understand him aright, man is the image of God, as to his outward (*forma*), and the likeness of God, as to his development (*materia*).

If we now turn to the Alexandrian Teachers, we are afforded a full supply of lore, in reference to the "image" and "likeness" of God in man. A few of the most prominent specimens must suffice. As a class, they strive earnestly to avoid and combat every possible conception of the Deity that savors of the crude and carnal. They find it, accordingly, impossible to lodge any God-resemblance in man's bodily constitution. They seem to be possessed of a very tender and delicate instinct against the anthropomorphism of a later period. It were, at all events, not the only instance to be found in the History of the Christian Church, when the weapons to be used during some yet unborn age, had been found all ready formed and stored away in her armory, even as the stones by which Goliath was slain, had not been miraculously placed by the brook in the moment of need only. Thus this entire School may be said to have labored and taught prospectively in this regard.

Clement, of Alexandria, is very positive. "So far as the

"image and likeness of God in man is concerned," he writes, "no allusion is had to the body of man. The mortal and the immortal have no affinity. What have mortality and immortality in common with each other? Much more is this Divine similitude to be sought for in man's Reason and Judgment, upon which element of his nature God has impressed His image, in order to the exercise of Charity and Dominion."

He is careful, notwithstanding, to distinguish between "image" and "likeness," subsequently. The "image" of God in man is by no means the same as his "likeness" to God. The former is already impressed in the process of birth, whilst the latter can only be said to be realized when perfection has been attained. The Divine Son of God is cited as embodying and realizing both "image" and "likeness" in Himself.

The ground for such a distinction is readily discerned. The spiritual nature of man warrants a comparison with the Deity in a two-fold relation, as it were. As an intellectual being, he stands already in a certain kinship with God, whilst he, still further, possesses the power of rendering his will in harmony with the Divine Will. In the New Testament the two points of comparison are plainly indicated. "And put on the new man, who, according to God, is created in justice, and holiness of truth." (Eph. iv. 24). "Lie not one to another, stripping yourselves of the old man with his deeds." (Col. iii. 9). "By it we bless God and the Father; and by it we curse men, who are made after the likeness of God." (James iii. 9). And as the double form—*εἰκὼν* and *ὁμοιωσις*—is preserved in the original record of his creation, it was felt that there existed a warrant to allot a peculiar signification to each term, in order to avoid an unbecoming tautology, as well as to invest them with a positive force. But since the fleshly body afforded but an unseemly lodgment for either, their next and natural refuge seemed to be, to draw a line of demarkation through his moral constitution, and to assign the several terms, "image" and "likeness," accordingly on opposite sides of the same line.

Clement advances still another thought in connection with this view, which we may not pass by unnoticed, as it may aid

us in making up our general *resumé*. The Logos is, according to his mind, the true and faithful "image" and "likeness" of God. The human soul is created after the Logos, and is, consequently, not a copy of the original, but a secondary edition.

Origen is of one mind, in the main, with *Clement* throughout, and maintains, that God's "image" and "likeness" must not be looked for in the body of man, since we cannot conceive of the Deity as compounded. With him too, the Divine Logos is the original "image" and "likeness" of God, of which the soul of man is a transcript or re-issue. He likewise distinguishes between the two terms—*image* and *likeness*—applying the former to the rational, and the latter to the dispositional elements in his moral nature. But not being sufficiently careful in employing the several terms uniformly, *Epiphanius* found room occasionally to charge him with teaching, that man had lost his God-resemblance in consequence of the Fall.

Novatian is satisfied by declaring the "image" and "likeness" of God in man to be found in his perceptive, and reasoning faculty.

Lactantius varies but little from *Novatian*. *Methodius*, at least according to *Photius*, is charged with advancing a number of theories on the subject in hand; but it is supposed that the latter but reflected his own mind, with a view of bringing the former under suspicion, and had *Methodius* felt inclined to reply, he might have adopted the words of his brother monk and chief assistant against the same adversary:—"You have thrown your darts into the midst of the crowd, yet pretend no one will be hurt.. How great soever the eyes of your wisdom may be, they are blinded by the smoke of avarice and envy. Your passion against *Ignatius* deprived you of your sight."

It is not material to adduce any further authorities on the subject, from this period, as those already quoted do full justice to the general mind and view in regard to it. Enough is gathered for the purpose of demonstrating the anxiety felt in reference to the sense of our Biblical and historical terms—*image* and *likeness*.

As we advance in the history of the Church, the same

variety, and, sometimes, opposition of views obtains. The *Anthropomorphites*, both of the Syrian and Egyptian branches, place the Divine similitude in the body of man, and represent the Deity under a human form. The Church Fathers repel the idea with great warmth and unanimity, as blasphemous. But, like all great errors, it too, seems not entirely to lack some foundation. St. Augustine concedes, that in a certain sense, the God-resemblance may be conceived of as extending to the body of man as well, inasmuch as it exists as a living organism, and, by virtue of its perfect mechanism, is more akin to the Creator, than that of the animal indeed.

Epiphanius is not satisfied with any one or all of the theories expressed in regard to the controversy concerning God's image and likeness in man, and prefers rather to accept the plain declaration of Scripture, without defining the limits within which the Divine similitude shall be made to reside. He is especially averse to teaching, that the characteristic which distinguishes man from the animal, has been forfeited by the Fall.

Both *Gregory*, of Nyssa, and, of Nazianzen, together with *Hilary*, agree, in a general way, in lodging it in his Reason.

Athanasius, on the other hand, finds it in man's capacity to know God, and remarks, that he had been deprived of this Divine gift through the consequences of sin. He rests his theory on another view of his, which he advances in regard to a certain God-cognition, which had been impressed in the act and moment of his creation, but which has been eclipsed by the Fall. He too, with *Hilary*, repeats the view already detailed in reference to the *Logos* being the direct exemplar after which the human creature is formed. *Gregory* of Nyssa, still further attempts to prove, that the spirit of man is a picture of the entire Trinity.

Cyril, of Jerusalem, distinguishes between "image" and "likeness," recognizing the former in the soul endowed with freedom, and the latter in the inhaled grace of the Holy Ghost.

Chrysostom observes the same distinction, but refers the

image to the dominion of man over the kingdoms of creature life, according to Genesis i. 26; and teaches that the *likeness* of God in man is to be found in his ability and duty to perfect virtue as it is in God. He declares the dominion of man over lower creatures to have been vastly curtailed in consequence of the Fall, since the whole animal kingdom had previously been filled with a far greater degree of awe for their mundane head.

Isidore endorses this view, and sees in man's primitive dominion the symbol of his God-likeness.

Theodore, of Mopsuestia, discards every rendering which would lodge the "image" and "likeness" of God in man, either in his intellectual nature, or in his jurisdiction over lower life, but is more ready to discern it realized in the fact, that man is to form the connecting link between the visible and invisible worlds—a middle-being, bridging over the chasm, which would otherwise yawn between mortal and immortal forces.

Diodore, of Tarsus, falls back on man's kingly prerogative.

Theodoret extends the God-resemblance in man so far, as to cover therewith every similitude which may be discovered to exist in common between God and man—a view which we judge broad enough certainly, for all to stand upon, only that it leaves us all at sea, as much so as ever.

Cyril, of Alexandria, narrows his theory down in so far as to refer the God-likeness to man's Reason, together with his capacity for virtue and dominion.

Augustine, in his earlier writings, had taught that Adam lost the Divine similitude through the Fall, as something imprinted of God during the act and moment of his creation. In later life, however, he retracted this view, and maintains, that it indeed remained subsequent to the introduction of sin, but so seriously deformed as to need a renewal. He treats of the "image" and "likeness" of God in man repeatedly, and is inclined to recognize both, severally, in his spirituo-intellectual nature, and in his kingly jurisdiction.

Thus might we continue to catalogue the individual opinions

of the writers of the Church through all the different periods, but without discovering anything materially additional or new. The later we descend, the more of an inclination do we discern in the authorities to return to the views expressed by the minds of those whom we have named. Whatever novelty might be reported from the schoolmen, Abelard, Bonaventure, Aquinas and Dun Scotus and others, it would not, we fear, either edify or improve the head or heart of the reader, who may have sat down with us, and thus far surveyed the photograph, which we have endeavored to present from the material drawn from an anterior age. With this impression, we come to examine into the reigning views current, during and after the Reformation period.

Among the various Confessions we search in vain for a special dogma, defining the sense and compass of the several terms "image" and "likeness." The *Council of Trent* and the *Roman Catechism* but briefly discuss the doctrine of the Divine similitude in man. The expressions, *imago* and *similitudo* are taken as general terms, by which the original perfection of the Paradisaic pair is taught. In a general way the Catholic church understands and teaches the Divine "image" and "likeness" in man to signify his immortality, the freedom of his will and his *justitia originalis*.

The *Orthodox Omologia* of the Greek church sees it in the perfect innocency of man before the Fall, in which state he possessed a perfect wisdom, freedom of will and immortality. The *Greek Catechism* develops this principle somewhat more fully, according to the interpretation of the Patriarch Jeremiah, and places the Divine similitude in the perfect harmony of man's attributes and forces, in his aspirations after perfection—without, however, preserving a distinction between *εἶκόν* and *ὁμοιωσις*.

The *Protestant* Confessions express themselves in general terms, according to one or another view already repeatedly advanced, whether we look to the Lutheran, Zuinglian, Calvinistic, Mennonite or Quaker persuasion. The variety of expression does not materially alter the sense. But as to any

distinction holding between the two characteristic terms, scarcely any mentioning of it is made. Calvin discards it entirely, and, of course, his followers think little beyond him. Zuingli and Luther speak of "image" and "likeness" as one word. The most marked recognition of any such distinction, is to be found in Bellarmine, who says:—*Imago ad naturam, similitudo ad virtutes pertinet; proinde Adam peccando non imaginem Dei, sed similitudinem perdidit.*

Later Theologians speak more fully on the Divine similitude in man, in treating of the Fall and its consequences. But it may well be doubted whether a single author can be pointed to, who utters anything nearer to our subject and aim than has been brought forward from the writers of former periods. We suspect Schleiermacher to have come quite near the truth when he declared: "It is not possible to define the primitive state of man within the compass of an exact dogma, and it is, consequently, just as impossible to teach with didactic force, in reference to his original perfection."

It is idle, therefore, to hope for light from Scott, Henry, Clark, Dick or any author of the more modern school, they, for the most part, being satisfied with simply retailing and expanding the material which their predecessors had gathered up and put into shape—and sometimes even, with doing worse.

From all that has been noted, it is perhaps possible to construct a general theory, which will embrace all the elements of truth, which are found to be contained in the teachings of the writers of the Church, during different ages, and which will serve to shed some additional light on what must ever remain a more or less dark theme.

The human nature embraces two constituent parts, as is evident from the Mosaic narrative—the BODY and the SOUL. The question may be raised, whether the body of man can in any way claim a resemblance with its Creator and framer? Every such idea is indeed scorned by late writers generally, and by a number of early commentators, as we have seen. "Descant ever so much, or ever so practically," says one, "upon man's upright and noble form, an upright form has no

more likeness to God than a prone or reptile one. God is incorporeal, and has no bodily shape to be the antitype of any thing material." This is strongly and bravely put, and seems to brand a few of the Fathers as very silly men, for entertaining a notion so foreign to truth. And yet when we come to think seriously of the *substance* of man incarnate, we are more inclined to believe man to be fashioned after Christ, than that Christ should have been formed after man. The grand aim in man's redemption, is to conform him "to the image of His Son." When the Scriptures present the Logos before us, as our antitype, we are inclined to view the *whole* Christ as such, and not a part of Him merely. "But we all, with open face, beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image." Into whose image? Evidently Christ's, "who is the image of God"—yea, "the express image of His person." Nor can the saying of Saint Paul (Phil. ii. 6-7) be quoted as of force against this view, since Christ's assuming "the form and habit of a servant," or, "likeness of men," evidently implies in the connection, His subjecting Himself to the state and relations of *fallen* man. After He had passed through His period and process of humiliation, and was ready to sit down at the right hand of God, He still possessed, in outward contour, as well as in inward rectitude, all the elements and factors which constituted Him from the beginning and for all eternity the Divine Exemplar for man. It is man's *Logosity* which Ireneus has in mind, when he refers the "image" of God to his physical side. In any lower, or carnal view, he is as far from the anthropomorphism of a later age, as are the Alexandrian Fathers. Even Methodius can be pardoned, in this view, for imagining man to rise from the grave with "hands and feet," as he evidently sees him with a Resurrection body, akin to that in which the risen Saviour appeared to His joyful Disciples. This one feature distinguishes man from angels and other creatures of God, likewise created in His image, in more respects than one.

But, verily, let us not confine the Divine similitude in man to his body exclusively. All that we plead for is, that this

factor of his being shall not be entirely ignored. And having made proper account of it, the way is more open to lodge the God-resemblance in still other niches of his being.

Much is made of man's *royalty*, by virtue of which he is to exercise "dominion over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and the beasts, and the whole earth, and every creeping creature that moveth upon the earth." Such a limited dominion may, it is true, be regarded as an image of the absolute dominion which God exercises. But who cannot see that this is but an accident or consequence of an element, lying back and in man's nature? He was created in the image and likeness of God *in order* to hold such sway.

Besides, the angels and heavenly host may with propriety be thought of as being invested with still greater power, embracing even man as a subject, so that this feature, even if we admit it to be one of the exponents of a Divine similitude, would not constitute a prerogative *specially* applicable to man. And yet the Mosaic narrative represents man peculiarly formed, *because* created "in the image and likeness" of God.

The same may be said in regard to the view which would lodge the God-resemblance in man's *intellectuality*; in his *spirituality*; in his *immortality*. Without doubt, all these prerogatives combined, enter into our conception of a human being; but is it not at once apparent that they are not exclusive possessions of man, or peculiar to him alone? What is there to forbid us to believe that all the several orders of angels and spirits are endowed with the same lofty characteristics? If we would find the "image" and "likeness" of God in man, we hold, that it is obligatory upon us to fix on one essential quality *peculiar* to him alone. And this we can only detect in his resemblance to the Logos incarnate, who is represented as the express image of God. It is difficult for a worshiper, never so spiritually inclined, not to border on what may be termed a legitimate and orthodox anthropomorphism, in so far as to conceive of God, as personated in the Logos. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."

Taking it for granted that Clement and Origen, and others entertained some such view of man's *Logosity* as constituting the *image* of God in his being, we see no difficulty in seeking for the *likeness* of God, in the perfection to be subsequently attained in a subjective way. Even if we admit a perfection in embryo, it is still further necessary that there should follow an actualization or realizing of the same in a consequent life and history. If the distinction which is universally made and admitted between *original* sin and *actual* sin, be not a mere distinction of the school, what is there in the way of admitting a similar distinction between an original and actual godliness—the *image* of God and the *likeness* of God in man? How does any more *scriptural* warrant appear in the one case than in the other? The fountain and its stream issuing of it, or the germ and the tree emerging from it, in the sphere of nature; the objective and subjective, or the abstract and concrete, in the parlance of the school, as well as original and actual sin, in Theology—these are but analogies to the relation which the Divine *image* and *similitude* in man sustain to each other. Or, if still further illustration is needed, it is afforded us in the relations which principle and history, or theory and practice bear to each other.

It is plain, from the position now taken, that the “image” is imprinted on every mortal, in the process of birth, as St. Clement maintains, or, in the act of creation, as is held by others. Whilst the “likeness” is as yet wanting, and may remain wanting entirely even, as the latter quality is something subsequent to the former, and involves a process of moral development, which depends on man's free will and personal co-operation. Only as both are made to merge or flow into each other, have we a complete picture of saintship, as it is in Jesus Christ, who is the perfect union of the Divine image and likeness—the Divine Proto-model.

This innate image constitutes the basis on which the acquired likeness may rest, in order to the perfecting of such a perfect saintly character; or, the organ of receptivity to the regenerating agency of the Holy Ghost, by whose working, in connec-

tion with man's co-operation, the likeness can alone issue from it as a product. It is by virtue of this image-organ in man, which is at one and common in both man and Christ, that he is still a redeemable creature, whilst the want of it renders the fallen angels irredeemable. The fallen angels have nothing in common with *our* Redeemer, and are consequently incapacitated to receive and appropriate His saving Grace in their own angelic personalities. To restore them to their forfeited estate, it were necessary for their proto-model, after whom they had been formed—if such there be?—to appear among them, subjecting Himself to their condemned condition, and to proffer them relief, who then, by virtue of the common nature extending to both parties, might embrace Him and gain deliverance. In the case of man, however, the circumstances are happily different. He, having been originally fashioned after the "image" of the Logos, who graciously assumed, besides, his fallen relations subsequently, at once recognizes his Deliverer, by virtue of the common image in both, and like Abraham of old, is glad. God did not arbitrarily construct a plan of redemption for man; but rather redeems him because he is *capable* of redemption through Jesus Christ, who stood to him in the relation of an "Elder Brother," already in the moment of his creation, in a certain sense, in consequence of the Divine image common to both. It is through their kinship prior to the Fall, that the plan of Redemption became so admirably feasible after the catastrophe of sin. Barring the Predestination factor, the Supralapsarian view is more congenial, than the Sublapsarian, which regards Redemption more as a remedy than as an original factor.

It is in view of this consideration too, that man can be elevated above the highest stage of angelic nature, on the one hand, or sink beneath the lowest grade of its condemnation on the other. Christ, by virtue of His Exaltation, has "led captivity captive," even to God's right hand. This is never predicated of angels and spirits in heaven. There is no provision or room left in their nature for such a glorification. It is only the living water that flows from out of the very throne of God itself that can thus seek and attain so high a level again.

It is only the creature created with God's image within him, and perfected in His very likeness again, through the regenerating grace of his homogeneous Redeemer, that can stand before the Lord God Omnipotent, without "veiling his face."

It is difficult, too, not to be haunted with the gloom of a still lower depth of depravity, in the case of a damned soul, than is occupied by the fallen angels. The strongest possible figures of woe are used in God's Word, by which the condition of condemned mortals is intended to be portrayed. Superficially read they seem indeed scarcely to be reconciled with the character of a God, the essence of whose being is Love itself, and to stagger sometimes even such as are of an honest faith. But when we come to recall the fact, that man carries within himself the "image" of God, which is capable of fruiting into His own glorious "likeness," and that both unitedly carry within themselves the possibility of constituting a character, meet for the company and association of the Triune God, in the highest heavens of felicity—when such a creature, with such a lofty destiny, should come short of his legitimate end, it is hard to imagine a pit bottomless enough for him to sink into. It is in consequence of his lofty nature, that he is dragged so far underwards, in case he enters on a decline. Tell us in whose image Lucifer had been created, and we may venture to assert, whether or not a fallen man can outmeasure him in his Fall. If the friends of God are to sit "on the right hand" of God, and His enemies be made His "footstool," will any one tell us how high an elevation, or how low a descent the several figures intend to indicate?

"The Resurrection of the Body" is a link in the chain which the Apostles' Creed forms. Stripping the article of every remnant of flesh and blood, which is unfitted for an entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven, we still are confronted by the idea of a Body, lying back and under all its carnal accidents, which the Incarnate Redeemer came to rescue, no less than the soul of man. The Divine Record teaches us that every seed produces a fruit after its kind. It is plainly for-

bidden, then, to believe in a Resurrection body, generically different from the human body, as originally created by God, after the "image and likeness" of the Divine Antitype. The corruptible, dishonorable, weak and natural elements transformed, into incorruptible, glorified, powerful and spiritual antitypes, does not convey to our mind so much an annihilation, as a sublimation into that body of the Son of God which had been set up for the entire man, in the morning of his formation and creation. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God"—bearing about us the original Divine *image*, quickened through the regenerating energy of the Holy Ghost; "and it doth not yet appear what we shall be"—when the Divine *likeness* shall have completely emerged; "but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him"—the embodied realization of both image *and* likeness; "for we shall see Him as He is." But He *is*, as He appeared in the mountain of Transfiguration, as He appeared unto Paul in ecstasy, or to St. John in Patmos—as He is beheld through the vision of Faith in the believer, who cannot conceive of Him otherwise than as the Protomartyr saw Him, in "the opened heavens, standing on the right hand of God."

A soul-inspiring little Legend echoes among the pages of different Commentators, in reference to the utterance of Malachi:—"And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver." A saint is said to have inquired of a silversmith, "why and how long it was necessary to *sit* in order to refine and purify his metal?" The answer came in the words: "In order that, and until I am able to behold my own likeness in the molten mass." The practical lesson to be learned, is, that the believer is cast into the furnace of tribulation, and is suffered to remain in, until the inherent and hidden image becomes visible and outward in the likeness, when only he is prepared to constitute a personality like unto the Son of man.

ART. III.—PRIESTLY MEDIATION.

BY GEO. B. RUSSELL, A.M., PHILA.

CHRIST by His own divine authority constituted the office of the Christian ministry. This office, holding in a distinct order, is to be perpetuated in the Church to the end of time. It always represents His own whole three-fold office, continued ever present in His mystical body. Without it, there could be no real approach to Jesus, no right use of the saving means of grace, and hence, also, no sure salvation for our nineteenth century sinners. Saving faith comes to those who believe on Him "through them" whom He has commissioned to this ministry. So He prayed for them to the Father, who always heareth Him.

Preacher, Priest and Pastor, all belong to this sacred office of the holy ministry. To reveal the will of God, and proclaim His word of Gospel grace; to administer His Holy Sacraments, and to stand in Christ's stead now between God and the people in public worship; and to lead and govern the flock by rules of Divine law, constraining them by love in the obedience to the faith; these parts and powers are all included in the Christian commission of the holy ministry.

Jesus Christ did in fact, appoint men to such an office for His Church; did call fit men to fill it. Divine authority adequate to disciple the whole world was committed to the Apostles of Christ, because to Him first, for this very end, was given "all power in heaven and on earth."

He did not rob Himself of any of this power, when He sent such men, clothed with His authority, to act in His name. He breathed on them, and prayed for them to have in full, His now

delegated official power. Not only to the Apostles was this given, but to those in turn believing on Him through them, and those again, who should become "faithful men, able to teach others also." Our Lord's power was not only taken with Him to heaven; but was left in this regard with men, who were really authorized to exercise it here in His stead, in His body, the Church, to the end of time.

Divine authority for the Gospel ministry, in the main, is not generally disputed by Protestants. As a distinct order of official administration, the *Preaching Function* is strongly affirmed. But the *Priestly Power* is by no means as steadily maintained. And even the *Pastoral Office*, in the guiding and governing of the flock, is by very few, as clearly held.

Entirely too wide a range this whole subject presents, to be pursued in all its many-sided importance. And, since the Preacher, as an officer of the Christian Church, has been so frequently considered to the exclusion almost entirely of the Priest, we propose to direct some consideration to this particular administrative function of the holy office. Can we claim on true warrant Priestly Mediation in the Gospel ministry?

Our Lord Jesus Christ is, of course, the only High Priest of our profession. He is at once, in His person mysteriously uniting the human and the divine natures, the fullness of the Godhead and the completion of our humanity. All that was in the types and shadows of the old economy, bearing upon man's salvation, held primarily in Him. Priest and at-one-ment, mediation and offering, sacrifice and remission all looking forward from the Jewish stand-point centre in His coming, till His promises, in the fullness of time, are fulfilled in Himself. Prophet, Priest and King are all one in Him. Are they ever represented in any true sense in any others, in His stead?

When He came, as the Light of the world, giving men life in order to see the light, and finally leading captivity captive and dispensing gifts unto men, He did not destroy the old order of grace; but, in the highest sense, did only the more perfectly fulfil and honor it, in all its requirements. Truly, he made room for merging the appointments of Judaism into the higher,

freer, and more spiritual ordinances of Christianity. The old Jewish rites, Circumcision and the Passover, are now the Christian Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. So the old Worship of the temple service, is now the more spiritual service of the Christian Cultus. And the old office of the Priesthood is now raised in a real exaltation, to the Christian Ministry. Divine revelation passes from the Old Testament into the New Testament, only as more full, more comprehensive, and more gracious. Christianity is therefore more than Judaism; a *new creation*, from the bosom of the old.

Priests, in the Jewish economy, were an order of men divinely called and ordained to minister to the people in holy things. By the mere fact of their birth in the house of Levi, of the family of Aaron, they were "*called of God*, as was" the first High Priest to the sacred office. Providential circumstances in the order of grace, over which they had no control, fixed their personal relations to this holy office and its mystical duties; and to this, they were therefore, in due time, by special rites, solemnly set apart and ordained. Awfully solemn as was their official responsibility, it came upon them without any first choice or mere act of their own. Fitness, on their part, required that they should honestly and rightly use their heavenly powers, according to the will of God.

Their official acts were not made to have value in what they did as pious individuals, but in what God did by and through them. Offering sacrifice and prayers from the people to God; or administering circumcision, or judgment, or blessing from God to the people, the imperfect personal character of the officiating Priest did not invalidate any of his official acts. Profane and wicked Priests were responsible personally to God for their sin, but the value of the official acts was in no degree destroyed.

Mediating between God and the people, the office of the Priesthood represented the invisibly divine dealing with men, and at the same time a real contact of the human service with the invisible presence of the Lord God; whom the people came to worship. In the nature of the case, no man can take this office upon himself by mere personal choice; and no man is so holy

that on account of his piety merely he can assume, fitly, its tremendous functions. Not in any such subjective conditions does the value or efficiency of this office consist. But when any man is called as was Aaron, the official mediation between the human and divine is real.

Its whole force, meaning, and value comes from the divine side. By virtue of the call and ordination from God, in the appointment and commission, the supernatural powers brought to bear in a human personality, are properly official. Those powers from one's acting thus in God's name and stead, the Apostle Paul compares to a treasure put in earthen vessels, so as to reveal the divine profiting, rather than any human excellence. And yet, it is an office, distinct and apart from the general priesthood and calling of believers.

So, in the Christian Church. Christ chose out of the whole number of His disciples, twelve to be Apostles. He did commit official duties unto them, answerable to His own three-fold office of Prophet, Priest, and King; all of which is to be perpetually in the Church. Priestly power is as much a reality, therefore, in the Christian Ministry as any other part of the sacred office. There is a special function in this office, by the divine commission lodged in the acting official, by the force of an objective authority and efficiency, bearing divine seals.

All, now as ever, centres nevertheless in the Person of the God-man, who ever liveth Head over all things to the Church; whose ordinances shall never fail, because He is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. The *whole* official character of the Christian Ministry is continued from the Person of Christ, through the Apostles onward to the present time. It has always been able to authenticate its heavenly commission in the promise that, for its own ends, our Lord will be always with His appointed prophets, priests and kings. No part of the office has since been abrogated by the authority that constituted it. Clothed with a real conferred power, the ministry go forth in the name of our exalted Lord; and neither at any time have the gates of hell prevailed to destroy any part of the ministerial office. The continuance of the Church, by the faithful preach-

ing of the Word, (Prophet) requires also the right administration of the Sacraments (Priest); and the proper ruling of believers, (King).

Yet in our day there are those who deny, that Christ has made and continued any special order, or ministerial office, in the Christian Church. The minister, they affirm, is nothing more than any other good man. His divine call and ordination by the appointment of Christ in the authorities of the Church, where the Holy Ghost's administrative power forever abides, all go for nothing. He is not more after He receives this authority, than He was before the sacred transaction. And even to claim for this, any divine authority and functional power, by the Holy Ghost thus operative, for ministerial acts by virtue of ordination, is popish. True freedom in this bald sense, conceives it necessary to deny all priestly ministerial acts. To escape priest-craft, the reigning popular mind disrobes the minister, and places him on a level with other people—unless his individual piety outranks his fellow Christians. His official acts, in the name of Jesus, they refuse to acknowledge as bearing the seal of invisible divine sanction, in any real supernatural way.

All this in the mouth of the profane infidel world, would not be so surprising. For the kingdom of the devil is always in hostility to the presence of the reign of grace, and will not hesitate to gainsay and blaspheme it. Whatever is in sympathy with them is plainly opposed to the kingdom of God. The world, the flesh and the devil are antagonistic to the reign of Christ; and therefore the offence of the Cross has not yet ceased.

Rationalism shows its affinity, right here, for anti-Christ in its sympathy with what is in hostility to the whole reigning order of grace in the Church. The supernatural, now at hand in the kingdom of heaven, challenges and rebukes carnal unbelief. And this last, to relieve itself denies the very existence of any higher present supernatural power.

Hence, the rationalistic class of thinking, now so common in some parts of modern Protestantism, rejects those supernatural

claims which a real Gospel ministry, if true to its heavenly calling and commission, must steadily put forth. A wrong conception of the objective grace of the gospel, may lead men far into erroneous and vicious thinking. It is certainly no more safe, to be found holding common grounds with rationalists and infidels, than to be found in some such points in company here with high-church men of Romanizing tendency.

Others admitting the existence of a sacred office of the *Christian* ministry, claim for it only *Preaching Power*. But it is difficult to admit this function, as a continuance of Christ's office, without logically also being required to provide for the *Priestly part*, as well. With the consideration of this, be it remembered, we are just now more directly concerned.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper as we have already seen, take the place in the new revelation of Circumcision and the Passover in the old. The mystical character of the old rites passed over into the New Testament Sacraments. So, Christian Worship now also takes the place of Mosaic ceremonial service; and yet, in its truly spiritual character, it unites the visible and the invisible in a most real way. So does the Priestly in the Christian Ministry hold the same analogous relation to the supernatural, that the old priesthood did, in its officiating place between God and the people. There must be a real visible, as well as invisible, mediation.

The fact that Christ has come to be the only Mediator between God and man, as the great High Priest of the New Testament, after the order of Melchisedec, does not take any sacredness or real official power from the holy office of those, whom He has ordained in His Church to represent Him. Because He ever lives and reigns our Prophet, Priest and King, those, with His commissioned authority and power, are sent to represent Him in all these among men. "As my Father hath sent Me, so send I you." "He that heareth you, heareth Me." Because all power in heaven and on earth is in His hands, therefore are there those authorized by Himself to exercise these gifts in His name.

Let us then consider more carefully, whether there is now **PRIESTLY POWER** in the Gospel Ministry.

Some will have it, that there is no offering upon the altar of the Gospel, in fact in no sense is there an altar at all in the Church, and therefore no need of one to make that office real. When you remind them that they are called upon to offer themselves as a living sacrifice unto God, which is a most reasonable service; they claim, that this is such a spiritual offering, that each one in the general priesthood of believers must make that personally. So for the offering of general Worship to God, they also assert the necessity of each one doing this for himself. There must be according to this theory no mediator between them and God. Immediately, all grace is to be received and all offerings to be made. Each one is to transact all spiritual matters between Christ and himself directly, with no one else standing in the way. It derogates in this same view from the Mediatorial office of Christ, and interferes with His High Priestly functions, to have any man represent these in His name here in the Church. And besides, it is liable to the worst kind of abuse.

To admit this false view, is to subvert the reality of the Church itself. As no one can understand the Truth of grace and salvation, "except some man teach" him; so, no one can offer himself to God and be received formally into His kingdom of grace without submitting to God's own appointed way. All truly pious Worship, whether of personal surrender, or of praise and thanksgiving, culminates in the Sacraments, as in Baptism and the Lord's Supper. But as no man can in the first instance, administer these unto himself; neither can he immediately worship God aright, till assured of reconciliation with Him. A man in contempt of court has no status there, till purged of that contempt by the office of some one acting for him. And the pardon of a criminal does not come to him with full effect, until officially announced by some one authorized by the executive. The priestly office in the ministry holds an analogous place in the Church. By this the Sacraments are

administered and sacrificial offerings of praise and thanksgiving are accepted of God.

Nor does this in any sense detract from Christ, as our only High Priest and Mediator. No person, even of very evangelical proclivities, would consider that the prophetic office of the Preacher, in the Gospel Ministry, whose duty it is unquestionably to *teach* the nations in Christ's name and stead; no one, we say, thinks this interferes with the official dignity of Christ, the great Prophet. And He also committed the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven "to His Apostles," without taking from Himself His regal glory, which He will in no wise give to another. Now, if this is possible and real, why may it not be *as possible and as real*, to delegate His priestly office of mediation and administration to men divinely ordained in the Gospel Ministry,—without detriment to His cause in the world, or loss of His dignity and glory in heaven? He loses nothing, by allowing men, in His name and enlightened by the Holy Ghost, to instruct the world in heavenly wisdom. Neither does He forfeit His High Priestly and Mediatorial glory, by sending men under the same Spirit, to carry forward His work among men, in officially administering the means of grace.

Men are no more likely to abuse the one trust, than they are to misuse the other. In both, they have power to act, only in accordance with His will. There is nothing in their office, to allow them to act by mere whim for themselves—as they please. Not in their own name, nor in their own strength; but in the Lord's name, with His authority and power, the minister of the Gospel goes forth in all his official acts.

"He gave some, Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Therefore are they called, appointed and sent, to be the messengers of the Lord of hosts, His ambassadors, and His priests, whose lips should keep knowledge. So, His ministers, by virtue of what is in them as Christ's anointed, become the light of the world, the salt of the earth, and where

two or three are gathered together in His name, there is assurance of His presence.

Official functions of whatever character among men imply mediation and intervening authority. The universal priesthood of believers does not prevent a special order in office, by divine call and ordination from God, in the Church. No more does universal citizenship stand in the way of there being special officers of the Government called and set apart to intervene and mediate between us and the civil power. By virtue of their office, they represent the government; and its authority reaches us only through their mediation. We can only thus know the government and get at it, in its official representatives. By these, its power and authority touch us. In short, we cannot find the government, with all its irresistible power to punish and protect, except as we have it mediated to us by the intervention of properly chosen and commissioned officials.

God's kingdom is just as real for our life; and it is mediated and authenticated to us, in a similar way. The unseen and eternal is revealed to us in Jesus Christ. But we cannot know Him, except as He makes Himself known to us, in His Word and Sacraments, by the Holy Ghost. He sends men therefore to declare His Word and, mediately to administer to us His Sacraments. We, in fact, never get these means, by which we learn to know and love Him, without the office of these men who are authorized and sent of God, to minister these unto us. These acts all hold in God through man, not by man of himself. No one however great his personal piety, who is not called as was Aaron, can take any ministerial function, priestly or pastoral, upon himself. Power to appoint and invest them, can only be by divine call and commission; and when so clothed, they are to us officially in Christ's stead, between God and man.

Real presence of the kingdom of heaven, with real Sacraments, conveying real grace, requires a real mediation of these to men. As they are also visible as well as real, the mediating official in their administration must be no less visible. Any thing less than this is of Gnostic tendency, or Quaker abstraction.

So, a real king does not always, not even generally, execute his own orders in person. And what he does by an ambassador is really done by himself, without detracting in any degree from his royalty, or power, or dignity. In Christ's kingdom, we may expect to find such analogies or likenesses. Our Saviour Himself says: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a kingdom," a king with servants to do his will; and He is now no longer Himself a servant, but appoints others in His stead.

Accordingly, we find this, in fact, in the practice of Jesus, while on earth in the flesh. When He fed the multitude He distributed the miraculous gifts of food and blessing to the people, by the mediating service of His disciples. To them He first gave, and the hungry people received it from their hands. The power and glory of the miraculous supply of the feeding was nevertheless Christ's, though He mediated this to the multitude in its administration. In the same manner also after His Ascension to the right hand of the Father; though He called Paul by His miraculous appearing, yet He sent Ananias to mediate the washing away of his sin, by administering Baptism to this end. So, too, the Holy Ghost directed the official authority of the Church at Antioch, to set apart Paul and Barnabas to the Gentile missionary work; and this was mediated to them by the laying on of hands and prayer. This was in full force in the early Church.

Thus, it appears that mediations, in administrative official functions, were continued, from the old, over into the operations of the new covenant. The divine factor of authority and power has never been sundered in the Church, from the living human official in the name and stead of Christ. We claim this as a genuine part of the truth once delivered to the saints. And it is not Romanizing to hold this priestly mediation in the Gospel ministry. In the early Church, before Romanism, there were Christian priests.

"It was one act of the priest's office to offer up the sacrifice of the people's prayers, praises and thanksgivings to God, as their mouth and orator, and to make intercession to God for them. Another part of the office was in God's name to bless

the people, particularly by admitting them to the benefit and privilege of remission of sins by spiritual regeneration or baptism. Above this was the power of offering up to God the people's sacrifices at the altar; * * * the sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving in commemoration of Christ's bloody sacrifice upon the cross, mystically represented in the creatures of bread and wine; which whole sacred action was commonly called the Christian's reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, or the sacrifice of the altar."—*Bingham*, I. p. 204.

As we learn of God by His word of truth in the mouth of His sent servants, and obey Him in the administration of His means of grace, through the authorized servants of the Lord; so we approach Him and receive the seals of His blessings at the hands of His servants delegated to mediate in His stead. This was part also of the office of the Old Testament priests. They represented the divine before the people, standing between them and the Lord Jehovah. They offered the people's prayers, praises, thanksgiving, petitions, intercessions and sacrifices. Only the bloody sacrifice has been abolished. The priest standing between the people and their judgments and blessings, they learned "the law at his mouth," for he was "the messenger of the Lord of hosts." The people had no higher appeal, or more direct and immediate approach in their own individual or collected wisdom, to the Lord.

Never were they to watch the priests and feel sure they could detect a purpose in their spiritual leaders to mislead them. The people were never exhorted to assume themselves purer and more spiritual than those placed *over* them, in the Lord. The most spiritual of all governments never raised the people, independently of all priestly intervention, directly to God. All spiritual acts were mediated by divinely ordained men.

Jesus did not, in the Gospel, revolutionize this relation. He charged His disciples to observe all the duties required of them, by those who sat in Moses' seat. He Himself did not, on fit occasions, set aside their office and its divine mediations, as when the healed leper was to show himself to the priests;

though He did, as their Master, rebuke their dreadful hypocrisy. In fact He could not dishonor Himself; therefore He would have His accredited servants honored, even if they personally were undeserving.

In the new revelation of His grace, the old having been fulfilled by exact obedience, the sacred office still holds first in His own divine-human Person. And, in the out-flow from His personal fullness, He honors Himself in the continued transmission of His priestly, as well as prophetic and kingly office from age to age. Those who, in His stead acting, "lord it over God's heritage," are not *usurpers of official trust*; but the charge against them is that they *abuse that which* has been really given them to rightly administer. Hence Paul admonishes the people, to esteem them very highly, who minister to them in Christ's name. Ordained by the Church, at the instance of the Holy Ghost, the people might, without risk or danger, love and trust them.

Christian ministers, in all their offices, have been much abused. Appeals to popular will and carnal prejudice have done much to degrade the whole office. The ministry, as *preachers*, ought to be heard as the oracles of God. If there has not been an utter mistake in their calling and ordination, they are able, by divine help, to teach the wisest people in the way of life, with more success, than mere unordained men. If they be regarded as *pastors*, by which name they are often distinguished in the New Testament, they are to be considered fit to lead the flock; not to be led, or driven, by the people—who ought to follow them into the green pastures and by the still waters, which the Holy Comforter provides. Or, as *bishops*, they watch for souls. The unfaithful watchman incurs a most fearful responsibility; but the Lord will hold him to account—not those who have not been faithfully warned.

Feeding the sheep and lambs requires the shepherd to manage and govern the flock, for which the Lord provides supplies. Abusing this trust, is again proof that the office has a real trust committed to it. But because of a possible danger here is no sufficient reason, why the flock should be taught.

that there is no such office; or if there is, that they should, as a rule, refuse to be led, presuming all the while that they will be misled, if they follow at all; and that they can enjoy the best pasture by finding it and seizing it for themselves.

People owe obedience to Christ in His ministry. They are to receive His blessings in His divinely appointed means of grace, which are mediated to them in signs and seals administered by the Gospel Priest-hood. Thus the operations of the Holy Ghost are to be made truly available. In this way, His voice is to be heard, in all humility and godly fear, in hearty repentance and obedient faith. Until Christ by a new revelation, authenticated by divine miracles, makes every one, as to this, a law unto himself as his own priest, he is bound to hear the teaching of the Church. What seems good to the Holy Ghost and the assembled Church authorities must be law for those who own and submit to the ministrations of Christ; not brought to us by angels or nature's agents, but by men, in the power of the Holy Ghost.

Just as in this way Christ has sent men to preach His Gospel, so does He also anoint them with the Holy Ghost to mediate His saving grace. There is no such danger, that the priestly will be more duly exalted than the prophetic, as to justify its total denial. Few people are really liable to be priest-ridden, except those who are warned by some ecclesiastical demagogue, in order that, taking advantage of their alarmed fears, he may use their aroused prejudices for his own sinister advantage. When irreverence and gross disregard for God's real presence, in holy things and sacred offices, is so general in the public mind, it is easy, cheap and popular, to raise a suspicious cry against those who rebuke this sin.

Worse than arrant folly is it, however, to thus invalidate the sacred authority of any part of the official trust of the holy ministry. One of the most grievous sins, for which God's people were made to suffer sore judgments, was their frequent unwillingness to hear His divine voice and accept His presence in the person of His ministering servants. History does not reveal a single case of God's blessing, where the people attempt

to set aside His ministry, and rush into His immediate presence. No reforms, even of acknowledged abuses, come in that way. The Reformation, in the Sixteenth century, was not a work of the people, as over against the Roman Catholic priesthood. It is a notorious fact, that the leading Reformers were themselves all ordained men, in the holy office, trained by the Holy Ghost in the old Catholic Church, for the sacred work God appointed unto them.

Gross impiety is it, therefore, to refuse Christ's divine mediation and priestly intervention reaching the people through authorized servants. It is a profane denial of His wisdom, in thus constituting His offices ever present in the Church. It is proud rebellion against His power, thus really challenging men, touching them, receiving on His behalf their formal submission, and bestowing in return the real benefits of grace.

It is not infallible, nor free from possible abuse; because it is an office held by imperfect men, liable individually to error and sin. Awfully solemn is the responsibility of this Christian Priest-hood. But so is any heavenly commission. That, to preach the Gospel and teach God's truth, is an official trust not always kept in perfect faithfulness. Priestly abuse of power is no greater sin, nor more common, than the shortcomings of Christ's Prophets. It is as awfully possible, and as likely found actual, that the preacher fail to preach Christ and Him crucified, as that the priesthood of the Gospel ministry fail to act in Christ's stead and in His name, and by His power alone.

Waiving all further excursion of treatment, we conclude as to this subject:

1. That, as all power in heaven and on earth is in the hands of our blessed Lord, He has it to dispense to His servants, whom He sees fit to clothe with any part of it, to act in His name.

2. That, although all Christians partake, according to our Catechism, of His three-fold anointing, yet, He has commissioned and ordained special officers, to represent Him more

fully than the whole people can, in His three-fold office of Prophet, Priest and King.

3. That, therefore, the *whole* of Christ's office is continued in His ambassadors in the Church; and hence, the Priestly element is now yet in the Gospel ministry.

4. That, in the New Testament there were really such acts of intervention and Priestly Mediation sanctioned and owned by the Holy Ghost; and that this self-same Spirit has, in the whole subsequent History of the Church, authenticated the official intervening mediation, in priestly acts, of those who minister to us in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

ART. IV.—THE RELATION OF THE PRESENT TO THE PAST
AND TO THE FUTURE.

BY REV. J. M. TITZEL, A. M., EMMITSBURG, MD.

WE propose, in the present article, to offer some thoughts on the relation which the present sustains to the past and to the future.

Do the events of time, like the erratic phantoms of a dream, follow one another without reason or order? or do they steadily and resistlessly move onward in strict accordance with established laws? Do they succeed one another in a mere mechanical way, or are they, as it were, organically bound together? and if so, what is the nature of their progression or development? These are some of the questions which shall claim our attention, and which we shall endeavor, at least, in part to answer, in the discussion of the subject now before us.

That the things which have been and those which are, and that the things which are and those which shall be, are in some respects intimately connected and dependent, is universally felt and acknowledged. Such connection is indeed a fact of such common observation, that it is impossible to ignore it. All men well know from their own experience that their present

is at least in many particulars the result of their past; and so, too, they know no less surely that their future will, in some measure, depend on their present. This much even the rude savage never fails to learn.

Few persons, however, are able fully to realize the fact that this connection is universal. That all things in the present have been affected and conditioned by the past, and that all things that shall be in the future will be affected and conditioned in turn by the present, is not generally recognized and felt to be the case. Most men are continually wont to think that it is otherwise—prone to imagine that they will be able, in many cases, to reap something altogether different from what they are now sowing, and to believe that there are many things which they may do which will in nowise affect their final destiny, but, on the contrary, will pass away and leave no trace behind. They have no doubt at all that many things pertaining to the present will tell on the future, but they can hardly conceive that everything that now exists and is going on will do so. That the victories of Alexander, of Cæsar, and of Napoleon, made a deep impression on contemporary affairs, and changed the course of history for all succeeding time, they readily admit, but they would consider as fanciful the assertion that the quarrels of lovers and the disputes of husbands and wives have also determined, in some measure, the character of the ages.

Yet it can be scientifically proved that there is nothing in the universe so small and insignificant as to be devoid of all value and importance in the sum of created things. On the contrary, it can positively be demonstrated that even the smallest atom of matter, or the most trifling product of man's intellectual and moral being, has its part to perform, and conditions in some measure the whole course of the world's subsequent history. What the earth now is, and what in the future it will be, it is and will be only because of the sum total of the things and powers which constitute it. If one grain of sand more had been originally created than there was, the earth would not now, nor yet in coming time, be just what it

is, and what it will be. For no power on earth, or belonging inherently to the earth, could ever have destroyed that additional grain, and yet existing it must have necessarily increased, to some degree, the attraction of the earth, and so affected the movements of the whole planetary system. Any change in these movements, however, would also have necessarily affected everything pertaining to the earth. Again, had the arrangement or the composition of the different atoms which compose the surface of the globe, at the beginning, been otherwise than it was, it would have led to a corresponding change in regard to everything else. The change might, indeed, have been, perhaps, imperceptible, but it would not on this account have been any the less real.

Now, what is true of the atoms of matter which compose the earth, is equally true of all the forces pertaining to the world, whether physical, intellectual or moral. Any change in any one of these, it could be readily proved, must produce a corresponding change in all the others. And this is so, not only as regards things and powers in space, but also as regards the same in time. Had a single thought in the past, accordingly, been different from what it was, no matter how trifling it might have been, it must have produced a corresponding difference in the thoughts of the present, and, consequently, also, in the thoughts of the future. A difference of thought, however, must likewise have expressed itself finally in a difference of action. Thus it can easily be perceived how a change in one sphere must lead to changes in all the spheres of existence.

But science does not only teach us that everything, however trifling it may appear, is really of value and importance in the sum of created things, but, also, that law universally prevails. ✓ Nothing takes place at random. There is no such thing as chance. Everywhere scientific observation discovers invariable connections of coëxistence and sequence among phenomena. The common experience of every-day life teaches us that night and day succeed each other continually in regular order, and that the varied seasons of the year, with singing birds and ripened harvests, with gathered fruit and chilling winds, un-

failingly come round at their appointed time. Astronomy makes known to us that among the stars also law exerts supreme sway, and that the planets, which like golden lamps are set in the sky, hold their place in the heavens, and pursue their course around the sun in harmonious concert preordained. Botany and Zoology show us that order and system prevail throughout the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and that in both growth and development proceed in accordance with fixed and invariable laws. Natural philosophy proves that even thunder and lightning, those fearful agents of the skies, are subject to the control, and may be made to do the bidding of man; while Geology informs us that law reigns through all knowable ages, and shows that the very same agencies have been at work from the remotest time. Moreover, statistics of marriages and of crimes reveal the startling fact that not even the actions of men are beyond the all-controlling influence of pre-determined law. Thus we perceive that law is predominant everywhere and at all times, and that there is nothing in the created universe which is not subject to its government.

Moreover, the discoveries and observations of science teach us that the relation which holds between the various forces and orders of existence and the succeeding events of time, is not merely mechanical, but organic. The whole creation is, as it were, but one grand and mighty organism, which in the onward flow of the ages is more and more unfolding itself, and, in predetermined solemn march, amid conflict and strife, is steadily moving onward towards its proper consummation. This, we think, is evident from the fact that everything is, as we have already observed, bound together in the closest connections and relationships; and still more from the further fact that the order of development which manifests itself in the growth of plants and animals may likewise be traced in the progression and unfolding of the events of history. We are confirmed in this conviction also by the testimony of Scripture, which clearly represents the entire creation as an organic whole. For we are not only taught in the book of Genesis

that the earth was cursed because of man's transgression, so that it might truthfully be said that when man fell,

"Earth felt the wound; and Nature from her seat
Sighing through all her works gave signs of wo;"

but it is expressly declared in the Epistle to the Romans, "that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." That the language of the apostle cannot justly in this case be resolved into anything like a mere rhetorical flourish, the whole connection of the passage in which it occurs, as well as the general tenor of scripture, abundantly proves. Thus Science and Revelation alike, as will ever be the case when both are properly understood, testify that the events of time are not related to each other, and do not follow each other, in the same way as the erratic phantoms of a dream. Both teach us that the products of time are most closely bound together, and, as it were, vitally connected.

From what has now been said, we learn that the relation of the present to the past is a most intimate one. The present is indeed, in a deep and true sense, the offspring of the past. What it is, it is only because of what the past was. Had preceding ages been different, the present would also be different. The solid earth on which we tread, the starry heavens above us, which in beauty look down upon us at night and watch our silent slumbers, the social and political organizations under which we live, the religious blessings which we enjoy, as well as the physical, mental and moral characteristics which pertain to us and distinguish us, are all what they are just because of what has preceded us. Had it not been for the discovery made by Columbus, and the oppression endured by our forefathers in the Old World, it is not probable, if we should be at all, that our physical appearance and mental and moral character would be what they are, or that we should live under the form of government of which we are now so justly proud. So, had it not been for the philosophical speculations of Plato, of Aristotle, and of the Schoolmen, and for the profound discussions and earnest defence of the faith engaged in by the fathers

of the first centuries of the Christian era, and for the reformatory movements of the Sixteenth century, we should not have the philosophical systems of the present, nor the theology of modern Germany and of Mercersburg, nor even the general religious knowledge which we now possess. In the present the past still lives, and moves, and has its being.

In the same way will what now is live in what will come after it. For in the same sense in which the present is the offspring of the past, will the future be the offspring of the present. What is now doing will permanently condition the character of what will be done when what is will have become what was. The studies in which we are engaged, the plans for private and public enterprises which we are devising, the institutions which we are establishing and endowing, the views which we are promulgating, together with all the thoughts which are occupying our minds, have to do not only with our own happiness and well-being, but also with the happiness and well-being of millions yet unborn. "No man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself." There is something startling in the thought, but it is nevertheless true, and, therefore, highly desirable that all should be deeply impressed with it.

But though the present is the offspring of the past, the result of its various tendencies and workings, yet it is in no sense the mere reproduction of the past. A tree, or an animal, in the process of growth and development, greatly changes its character. Sometimes indeed it is difficult to realize that what we now see before us is the same plant, or animal, as the case may be, on which we used to gaze in years gone-by. Now it is so to a great extent with regard to all things by which we are surrounded, and which come within the sphere of our experience and activity. We ourselves are not just what we were some years ago. We have changed physically and mentally. Our outward appearance is in more than one respect different from what it was, and the views which we now entertain are by no means those which we entertained, when in early youth we built our airy castles, and with eagerness sketched in fancy

the picture of ourself in coming years. The present reality contrasts strangely with what was imagined in the dreams of youth. *Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis*. But as it is with us, so is it with all mundane things. The physical aspect of men generally is, in more than one particular, different from what it was in centuries that have passed away. Of this we have a striking illustration in the descendants of the Irish and German in this country, who in many cases scarcely retain any longer any resemblance at all to their ancestors. The social, political and religious life of the present is also different from that of the past. The customs of society have undergone great changes, and much which was once considered unobjectionable in manner would not now be tolerated. The Monarchies of Europe to-day are not what they were six centuries ago, nor is the Republic of the United States what the Republic of Athens was. The Church of the present, too, whether we consider the Greek, Roman or Protestant branch of it, as regards both the apprehension of doctrine and the form of government, is not what it once was. Neither Protestantism nor Roman Catholicism stands just where it did in the Sixteenth century. Changes have taken place in both as they have in everything else.

But as the present differs from the past, so also will the future differ from the present. The coming ages will no more be a mere reproduction of the present than the present is of the past. Changes have not only taken place in the material substances which compose the earth; in the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms, and in the social, political, and religious organizations of mankind, but will continue to take place until the final consummation of all things will be reached. Though it is frequently very positively asserted that history repeats itself, yet this is not strictly correct. History never repeats itself. The earlier events of time, it is true, prefigure the later, just as the first leaves of a plant are a type of what the last will be, but there is no more repetition in the former case than there is in the latter. The life of the world, so to speak, remains, indeed, ever the same, but the forms in which it manifests itself

are continually changing. The future, therefore, must necessarily be different from the present. In coming years not just the same phases of life will present themselves for consideration which now claim our attention, and the vital questions of to-day will not be likely to be those of the distant morrow.

But here the inquiry arises, How does the present differ from the past? and what will be the nature of the changes which we may expect in the future? A careful comparison of the past with the present alone can enable us to give a proper answer to this inquiry. Now such comparison, we think, will disclose to us the fact that there are at least three respects in which the latter as a rule differs from the former. There may be said to be generally if indeed not always, more diversity, more definiteness, and more unity manifested in the present than there was in the past. This is scientifically proved to be the case in vegetable and animal organisms. In their development there is always a change going on through continuous differentiations and integrations from the more simple to the more complex, and from the less definite and coherent to the more definite and united. And we all know this to be the case as regards our own life. Our thoughts, views, and mental acquirements are at present far more varied than they were years ago. So they are also more distinct and coherent. Many of our ideas and opinions which formerly were very vague, are now clear and definite; and many things which we then associated together in a mere mechanical way we now recognize as necessary parts of a systematic whole. But what science has proved to be true of the development of vegetable and animal life, and we know from experience to be true of our own development, there is abundant reason to believe is equally true of the development of all the products of time—of all the evolutions of history.

The present throughout shows more varied forms of life and of thought than the past. Increased diversity is indeed everywhere discoverable. Even the earth itself, which we are inclined to look upon as fixed and permanent, as to its outward form, Geology teaches us is far more heterogeneous now than it

once was. When as a fluid mass in ages long gone by it revolved around the sun, it could not possibly have presented the diversity of appearance that it now does, with its mountain heights and ocean depths, its hills and valleys, its lakes and rivers, its shady groves and flowery meadows, its desert wastes and cultivated plains, its dense forests and many-peopled cities, together with its almost endless variety of vegetable and animal life which is continually becoming more and more complex. Man himself, also, strikingly shows the tendency there exists and manifests itself in the onward flow of the ages towards heterogeneity. Once there was but one family among the members of which there must have been a marked similarity, but now we distinguish no less than five distinct races with an ever-increasing diversity of form and feature. Turning from man to his social, political, and religious organizations, we shall find still more conclusive proof of the fact which we are considering. All these, as any one may readily convince himself by an examination of them, are more complex and varied now than they were centuries ago, or even until within quite recent times. So too is there increased diversity in men's speech. Once all men spoke in one tongue, but now we have no less than eighty different languages and more than three thousand different dialects. The vocabularies of these different languages are also steadily increasing, and never were our dictionaries so bulky as they are now. In the arts and sciences the same increased variety, it is scarcely necessary to say, is likewise observable. The number and importance of its scientific discoveries is, indeed, one of the most marked features of the present age. The most striking evidence, however, in favor of the truth of what we are maintaining is, perhaps, furnished in the increased facilities of communication which we possess. First men could make known their thoughts, wishes and doings to one another only by speech. But in the onward course of time writing was invented, and then printing came to their assistance. Next steam increased their power of imparting information, and now we have, in addition to all these modes of communication, the Electric telegraph, by means of which news are almost instan-

taneously conveyed from continent to continent, and we are thus enabled to know what is going on in the old world earlier in the day than it there occurs!

But there is also more definiteness in the present than there was in the past. The outer form of the earth is not only more diversified than it was when a fluid mass, but also more distinct. The races of men are now more definitely marked than they once could have been. The social relations between man and man are also more clearly established and fixed. The individual, moreover, has become a more definite and prominent factor in government than he was in ages past, and his separate existence and rights are, consequently, more fully recognized by those in authority. The language of men is likewise not only more diversified than it once was—does not merely afford greater variety of expression, but also conveys far greater definiteness of meaning. The lines which separate the different sciences are daily being more fully determined and deeply drawn, and the knowledge which they impart is far more clear, distinct, and satisfactory than it was even a few decades ago. In Theology, too, there is decided advancement in this direction. Many doctrines which were once vague have been clearly defined and established, and the form of others is now coming to be settled and fixed. The doctrine of the Trinity, of the Person of Christ, of man's depravity, and of Justification, for instance, are all more fully developed, and more distinctly apprehended, than they were in the first centuries after Christ: and the doctrine of the Church which of late years has been so earnestly discussed is also beginning to be more and more clearly understood.

In addition to the increased diversity and definiteness of the present, there is also an increased unity. This statement at first thought may seem to involve a contradiction. It might at least appear to some as if diversity were incompatible with unity. Such however is not really the case. There is less diversity in a stone than in a tree, yet there is far greater unity between the different parts of the latter than between those of the former. The greatest diversity indeed may, and even does exist along with the deepest and most real unity. This is strik-

ingly manifest in the higher forms of organic life. But diversity is not only compatible with unity, but the unity may be said to increase with the diversity. That the surface of the earth, though more varied, is yet more coherent now, than when it was a molten mass, no one who is acquainted with the peculiar qualities of fluids and solids can fail to perceive. In the present, also, we find mankind, notwithstanding the diversity of races and occupations, more closely bound together by the ties of interest and of humanity than at any previous time in history. The exclusiveness which once prevailed among families, and later among nations, has in a great measure passed away, and now more than ever before is the fact recognized and felt that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." In the sciences there is in like manner manifested an increased unity and dependence. We now know them to be far more intimately related to one another than centuries ago they were even imagined to be.

But in as much as the same agencies have been at work from the remotest time, we may reasonably infer that they will continue to operate, and that, therefore, what characterizes the present in its relation to the past, will also characterize the relation of the future to the present. Coming years will bring with them ever-increasing diversity, definiteness, and unity in the various physical and intellectual, social, political and religious movements and products in the sphere of time, until the apocalyptic angel whom St. John saw in his sublime vision of the future, standing upon the sea and upon the earth; with hand uplifted to heaven, shall finally proclaim that time shall be no longer. We may therefore confidently expect that in the future there will be greatly increased definiteness of scientific knowledge, and that many important discoveries will yet be added to those already made; that the claims and rights of the individual—whether man or woman—will be more fully recognized, and that governments throughout the world will consequently tend more and more toward the republican form; and that the doctrines of our holy religion will become better and better understood, and more clearly defined and fully es-

tablished. There is also reason to believe that the different departments of Natural Science will be proved to be still more intimately related to each other than has yet been demonstrated, that the different nations of the earth will be more closely confederated, and exercise a more restraining influence over each other, and that the Church, now so sadly divided, will become more fully united than she ever yet has been. At the same time this advancement will be made only as in the past amid the conflicts and disorders engendered by sin, which will continue until Christ shall make His second appearance, when the whole order of this world "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God," and time itself shall end in eternity.

In the way of inference from what has now been advanced in regard to the relation of the present to the past and to the future, I would yet add, in conclusion, that if the views stated be correct, it necessarily follows, that all efforts at re-instating the past must in the end prove a failure, whether it be attempted in Church or State, or even in social life. The forms of the past are not suited to the present, for the present, is not what the past was. As it is unseemly for a man to act as a child, even so are the forms of the past unseemly in the present. Such forms did their work and have rightly been buried. It is a wrong to them, a wrong to the present to disentomb them. At best they can now be only unsightly mummies.

So it is also in vain for us to think of legislating and establishing permanent forms of any kind for all coming time. What suits one generation will often not suit another at all. Each age, as it is necessarily different from all others, has wants of its own which it alone can understand and provide for, and any effort on our part to do the work of those who shall come after us, must, therefore, in the very nature of the case, be ineffectual in the accomplishing of its purpose. The only way in which we can truly advance the cause of truth and righteousness in the future, is by performing properly the duties of the present.

**ART. V.—THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD THE PILLAR
AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.**

BY REV. D. Y. HEISLER, A. M., MT. ALTO, PA.

PRINCIPLES control and shape the destiny of man. They are the governing forces in the history of our race. Thoughts, feelings, sentiments, according as they are either good or bad, virtuous or vicious, give form and shape to our life, and impart to its varied phenomena the quality of strength or weakness, of beauty or deformity. Actions, in fact, are but the outward expression of hidden forces—of cherished sentiments within. Correct views and principles, accordingly, are of the first importance, especially in the highest and holiest sphere of life—in the kingdom of grace.

The views or sentiments which we entertain of the Church determine, to a very large extent, our life and conduct—our bearing in God's House. The two things stand intimately related to each other, and cannot well be separated. They, who think lightly of the Church, will generally be found triflers in the Sanctuary; while they, whose views of the Church are of an elevated, enlightened and refined cast, will be likely to maintain a correspondingly lofty, yet modest and devout bearing in God's House, and demean themselves with becoming reverence in the place where God's name is recorded and where His honor dwelleth. No wonder, then, that the holy apostle was so anxious that his son Timothy should be well instructed in the nature and office of the Church, not even forgetting him at a distance, and amidst the hardships of his long and wearisome journey. After giving him a most beautiful and graphic picture of a Christian bishop, he proceeds to say: "These things I write unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly;

but, if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the House of God, WHICH IS THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH."

To ministers of the Gospel, especially, as well as to church members generally, this beautiful passage, as also the entire Epistle, is replete with interest; containing, as it does, a number of excellent practical counsels and directions addressed to *Timothy*, and, through him, to all office-bearers in the Church. Paul, it seems, had left him in Ephesus, a city of Asia Minor, to have charge of the churches in that region of country, and to exercise a general supervision over them during his own absence on a missionary tour to Macedon. Fearing that he might possibly be delayed beyond his expectations, and apprehending evil results in case it should so happen, he wrote him this Epistle, hoping that it would supply in part, at least, the place of a personal interview. In the above-cited passage, he states the object of the Epistle, and of its counsels and directions, which was to show the young and inexperienced Timothy how he ought to behave himself in the "House of God;" and, in order to impress him with the *importance* of the subject, he goes on to give him a description or definition of the house of God, which is, says he, "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth"—thus linking his demeanor in the Sanctuary with the superior dignity and importance of the Church as a divine institution. The kingdom of God, as here represented, wears a two-fold aspect. As it looks back to its divine origin, nature and form, or in its relation to the Almighty, it is "the Church of the living God;" as it looks forward to its end or office, or in its relation to the world, it is "the pillar and ground of the truth:" and, now, *these two ideas*, which lie in the very conception of God's house, are to regulate the conduct of Timothy, and so also of all others in the Church, whether as officers or private members simply—"that thou mayest *know* how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God."

In the treatment of this subject, therefore, I shall, in the first place, offer some remarks on the nature and import of this

title or phrase: "House of God;" then show in what sense it is "the Church of the living God," and, as *such*, "the pillar and ground of the truth;" and, in the last place, I shall point out some things which should characterize the conduct and bearing of all those who are in the "House of God," either as office-bearers or as private members.

First, then, the import of the *title* by which the Church of Christ is here designated—"House of God"—what is its meaning? The term house (*οἶκος*) is usually employed to denote the building in which we live—a literal dwelling-place. In this sense we use the expression, "House of God," to denote the building or house in which God is worshiped, and where He has promised to hold communion with His children, as He Himself has said: "In *all* places, where I record My name, will I come unto thee, and I will bless thee." In this way we speak of the church edifice as the House of God; and even in this lower sense, already the term has something sacred in it; for the place where God's honor dwelleth, and where His name is recorded, is a *holy* place, and as such it ought to make us feel as did Jacob, when, waking out of his sleep, he said: "Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not. How dreadful is this place; this is none other but the House of God, and this is the gate of heaven." In the passage under consideration, however, the term "*οἶκος*," signifies not the building or material structure, but the inmates of the house; and the entire phrase—"House of God"—denotes, therefore, the family of God, the whole body of His children. He is the universal Parent of all them that are called children in heaven and on earth. But this definition is perhaps too general and indefinite; for, in one sense, all men are the children of God, and so *all* men would seem to be included in this house or family. So it undoubtedly would be, if all things continued to be what they once were; but, since the ruinous fall of our race, "we are by nature the children of wrath, even as others; being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise—having no hope and without God in the world." Hence the expression which is here em-

ployed—"House of God"—is so explained as to limit its meaning and confine it to a certain class of men only, and also to point out their office and calling: "The House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." What, then, is the difference between the two phrases?

The term CHURCH (*ἐκκλησία*), as here employed, is more specific and limited in its meaning. It signifies an assembly or convocation, or, literally, an *election*—an assembly of persons who have not only been called together, in a lawful way, but an assembly of men who have been "*called out*"—out of the world and its corrupt fellowship, and organized into a separate and distinct body, for the accomplishment of separate and distinct ends, in the use of peculiar and divinely-ordained means and ordinances. "For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." Peter also distinguishes the "Elect" from the faithless and disobedient, in these remarkable words: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvelous light."

But it is "the CHURCH of the LIVING GOD." Perhaps this descriptive term "living," as applied to God, is intended still further to define, and give a more specific designation to the Church, as a *living* body—"chosen to everlasting life"—by its union with the living God. Men naturally are "dead in trespasses and in sins," but in Jesus Christ are "made alive again." Once we *all* were "the children of wrath, even as others; but God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us

together with Christ, and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." Hence Peter, speaking of Christians, says—that, "coming unto Christ, as unto a living stone, *they*, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." And Paul finishes this beautiful picture by saying: "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."

These explanations of the titles by which the family of God is designated—"House of God" and "Church of the living God"—will enable us to understand fully, and duly to appreciate the interesting nature of the Church of Christ. It is an "ELECTION"—not a common multitude indiscriminately gathered together. She—"the Church of the living God"—is of royal descent, of divine origin, and of supernatural constitution, invested with peculiar gifts and graces; and, along with other ensigns of royalty, destined to wear a diadem of pure gold. Many indeed are "called," but few only are "chosen;" and the Church of God is that "chosen generation," that "peculiar people," whom God has graciously espoused to Himself in an "everlasting covenant." These are precious to Him "as the apple of His eye," and "graven on His hand." It is true that in the Church visible there are many who bear but the name of disciples; and all men, who are truly interested in the Church's prosperity, sincerely regret and bewail this state of things; but they know also, that, however numerous are the hypocrites in "the congregation of the saints," it is yet in the deepest sense of the term "the Church of the living God"—the "ELECT LADY"—of whom the apostle John so highly speaks. These precious "plants of righteousness" are God's peculiar treasure. They are "the temple of

the living God;" as God hath said: "I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people."

These familiar explanations and remarks on the "House of God" will also enable us to understand the deep solemnity and importance of the Church's calling. As a "chosen generation" and a "peculiar people," Christians are "to show forth the praises of Him who hath called them out of darkness into His marvelous light;" and, as a "royal priesthood," they are to "offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." What an important office are they to fill, whose work is—to make known to a dying world the riches of God's grace and mercy—to be "the salt of the earth" and "the light of the world"—to be "a city, that is set on a hill," and "cannot be hid." In view of this infinitely important calling, "the Church of the living God" is said to be "THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH."

This title of "the House of God" designates the Church's official character—the relation which it sustains to the world. The language, it will be observed, is figurative, and we must therefore try to ascertain its meaning. "Pillars"—*στυλοί*—may be said to serve two general purposes. The few notices, which we have of them in primitive times, show that in the earliest ages of the world, already they were employed as *historical monuments*, set up in memory of some person, action, or important event. So the temerity of Lot's wife was punished by her being turned into a "pillar of salt," as a perpetual monument of God's wrath. "Salt" is the emblem of perpetuity—of imperishableness; and her being suddenly transformed, by a divine judgment, into a "pillar of salt," signifies that her sad and fearful doom is to stand upon record as a permanent historic fact, to bear witness "that God is a just God and true, and that He will in no wise clear the guilty," in order to warn the unfaithful, the doubting, the apostate, against venturing on a similar experiment with the Almighty; for it is written: "Remember Lot's wife;" and, as long as the everlasting Gospel shall continue, so long too shall this solemn

sentence stand upon its sacred pages as a warning to the wicked!

Under circumstances precisely the opposite, Jacob set up a "pillar," as a monument of God's mercy. When, on a certain occasion, tarrying all night under the open heavens; he dreams—"and, behold, a ladder set upon the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it: and Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone which he had put for his *pillow*, and set it up for a *PILLAR*, and poured oil on the top of it; and called the name of that place *BETHEL*—that is, the House of God." Here we have a vision of the Spirit-world mercifully granted unto Jacob; and, to perpetuate the memory of this remarkable event, he sets up a *monumental* pillar, which, in *history* at least, has ever since stood as a beacon-light to support, and silently to publish the truth respecting God's gracious manifestation of Himself to the children of men, from age to age, as circumstances require. It was intended to be, and is well adapted to serve as a sacred memorial of God's grace and mercy.

Of like import was the *pillar* of "twelve stones" set up by order of Joshua. The stones were taken from the bed of the Jordan, which had just been crossed by the hosts of Israel, and were set up in a *circle*, to commemorate this remarkable event. It was to be a "sign" among the Israelites, that, when their children should ask them, in time to come, saying—"what mean these stones?" they were to answer them, "that the waters of Jordan were cut off before the ark of the covenant of the Lord." And "these stones shall be for a *MEMORIAL* unto the children of Israel forever;" or, in other words, this circular heap of stones was to be a *monument* to preserve in the minds of the people, and to perpetuate to all future generations the memory of this event—this act of divine interposition. These "twelve stones," each representing one of the tribes of Israel, were an expressive symbol of God's universal Church—of *ZION*, which literally signifies something raised up, as a heap of stones, a pillar or monument.

These examples are sufficient to show what important purposes the "pillar" may serve when employed in the way of *historical monument*. The application is easy. The Church is the standing monument of God's mercy and grace in the world—a "living Epistle, known and read of all men," and perpetually "holding forth the word of life."

At first, these monumental pillars were always erected in those places, where the events, that were to be commemorated, had occurred. In the course of time, however, they were set up, *occasionally*, at least, in connection with some public building; or the "pillars" of an edifice, already erected, were simply furnished with some suitable inscription, and in this way made to answer the purposes of a monument. Hence the PILLAR came to be extensively employed as the symbol of strength and beauty—of ornament and support. So James, Peter and John, it is said, "seemed to be pillars" in the Church, because they were the most eminent among the apostles—the founders of the Church—and constituted its chief ornament and support: and Jesus Christ, in His Epistles to the seven churches of Asia, says: "Him, that overcometh, will I make a pillar in the temple of My God, and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of My God, and the name of the city of My God, which is the new Jerusalem; which cometh down out of heaven from My God; and I will write upon him My new name."

When employed in architecture, "pillars" are always, and naturally the stay, support and ornament of a building; and, it would seem, that, in some instances at least, they literally sustained the building, so that without them the superstructure could not stand. As an illustration of this fact, I need but refer to the celebrated temple of Dagon among the Philistines. It was in this temple that the haughty Pagans were assembled to celebrate their triumph over the unfortunate Samson. After putting out his eyes, they unfeelingly asked him to make sport for their special benefit and diversion; but he, in his agony, turned to the God of might, who does not forget His injured children, and said: "Strengthen me, I pray Thee,

only this once, O God, that I may be avenged of the Philistines for my two eyes. And Samson took hold of the two *middle pillars* upon which the house stood, and on which it was borne up. And Samson said, Let me die with the Philistines; and he bowed himself with all his might, and the house fell upon the lords of the Philistines, and upon all the people that were therein." It is evident, from this history, that these two "middle pillars" absolutely sustained this magnificent temple; they were the prop and stay of the superstructure. So likewise in the Jewish Temple, Solomon set up two beautiful "pillars"—one on the right and the other on the left of the principal entrance; which, besides being highly ornamental, seem from their names to have served a similar purpose. These pillars were made of brass, surmounted with "chapiters" and ornamented with "checker-work" and "wreaths of chain and lily-work." The one on the right he called *Jachin*, which signifies *stability*, or "he shall establish"—the one on the left he called *Boaz*, which means *strength*, or "strength is in it." All the circumstances connected with the getting up of these magnificent pillars, go to show that they were intended to serve the two-fold purpose of *support and ornament*, or, in other words, to beautify and sustain the superstructure. Both in ancient and modern architecture, the columns or pillars play an important part, and almost always serve this *double* purpose of ornament and support. They are not only the stay and prop—the ornament and beauty—but also the most substantial part, and lasting memorials of the edifices to which they pertain. So important are these "pillars" in perpetuating the memory of the buildings which they sustain and beautify, that, amidst the ruins of ancient cities, after ages of desolation, these noble pillars still remain to testify in solemn, silent, overpowering grandeur of what *once* was, but is now no more! Those splendid superstructures—the work of ages—have been long since shattered to pieces and blown down by the sweeping tornadoes, and their precious materials—treasures, ornaments and inscriptions—scattered and mingled with the desert sands, while the *colossal pillars* still stand as sentinels over the sad

ruins, and in solemn silence recount the melancholy story of their former grandeur!

The *importance* of these remarks will appear in its proper place. All I wish to say in this connection is, that the CHURCH OF CHRIST is "the pillar and ground of the truth," in the same sense *precisely* as the pillars in an edifice are the support and ornament—the perpetuating medium—of the building. It is the prop and stay of the entire system of divine revelation, and the only sure guarantee and infallibly certain and successful medium of its perpetuation in the world!

But, to make things *doubly* sure, and to exclude even the possibility of a mistake, the Apostle employs a *compound* figure, and calls the Church of the living God "the *pillar and ground* of the truth." This word "GROUND"—ἐδραιώματα—literally signifies a *foundation*, and is used in connection with the word "pillar" to *strengthen and intensify* its meaning. It agrees, in fact, with the word pillar in its fundamental idea or significance. The original word—ἐδραιώματα—is derived from ἔδρα, a *seat*, and signifies something *settled, fixed, or firm*, or from the verb ἐδραῖω—to fix firmly, to establish, to make permanent or secure. Its meaning is exceedingly strong and comprehensive. When, therefore, it is employed as a symbol, it signifies a firm *support, stay, or basis*—literally and in the strongest sense of the term, a FOUNDATION. This identifies it very nearly, as we have already intimated, with the word "pillar." What a good, solid, strong foundation and massive pillars are to the *strength and durability* of an edifice, that "the Church of the living God" is to the truth—its support and basis, namely, and the only *sure* guarantee of its purity and continued maintenance in the earth. The Church is, in the deepest and truest sense of the terms, "the pillar and ground of the truth."

This thought—the prevailing idea of the apostle's language, which, in substance at least, forms the caption of our article—I shall now proceed to illustrate and confirm. And, in the

first place, it is proved by the nature and office of the Church, as represented by Jesus Christ in His sermon on the mount.

"YE ARE THE SALT OF THE EARTH," says our divine Lord. The nature and properties of salt are such as to make it the emblem or symbol of perpetuity. It contains within itself the elements of imperishableness, and likewise has the capacity to communicate these conservative properties to foreign substances, and so to preserve them from decay. So likewise the Church, as the "body of Christ," contains within itself, by divine gift, the elements of eternal life. She only, as the subject and bearer of a divine imperishable life, possesses the true principle of *stability*, and gives life and immortality to her children. Standing in vital union and communion with her risen Lord, she partakes really and savingly of His blessed life. "Because I live," says the Redeemer, "ye shall live also;" and "Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." This is "the *mystery*, which hath been hid from ages and from generations," says Paul, "but now is made manifest to His saints—which is, Christ in you the hope of glory." On the confession of Peter: "Thou art the Son of the living God," Jesus answered and said: "Upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." And, "the kingdom of God is in you"—permanently in you, as the leaven of eternal life to the world. "Ye are the salt of the earth."

AGAIN: "YE ARE THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD." What does this mean, except that the Church is the *bearer of light*, and the rightful dispenser of it to the world. The children—numerous as the sands upon the sea-shore, and countless as the stars of heaven—are all "the children of light." Once indeed they were *darkness*, but now they are "light in the Lord." And hence they are exhorted to be "blameless and harmless, the sons of God without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom," says the apostle, "ye shine as lights—luminaries—in the world; holding forth the word of life." By some the allusion, in this passage, is

supposed to be to the luminaries of heaven—the sun, and moon, and stars; others conjecture that there is a reference to the ancient “light-houses.” The original word—*φωσφόρος*—in fact signifies watch-fires, guard-lights or beacons. Whatever be the immediate reference, the meaning evidently is—that Christians, as a body, are to be luminaries—light-bearers—in the world, set in the spiritual firmament for its benefit and safety. Hence Jesus Christ says: “Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.”

Let us endeavor still further to illustrate and confirm this peculiarity of the Church's nature and influence—its perpetuity and usefulness—as they are found to be involved in the conception of a “city that is set on a hill,” and “cannot be hid.” What is the force—the meaning and import of this figure? It is clearly this—that the Church, as a compact body, is to serve the double purpose of being a living monument of God's mercy and faithfulness, in the past, and a spiritual hospital—a house of refuge for penitents in all time to come—the conservator of all that is beautiful and good in the world—“the pillar and ground of the truth”—the perpetual guarantee of its continuance, purity and ultimate triumph among men!

This “city of God” is on a “hill”—occupying a position so elevated, and surrounded with an atmosphere so pure, that she is always visible, and fully in sight from all parts of the earth. Far removed from the low-lands of sin and vice, she is not only not affected by the *incumbent* fog and mist, which lie, so cold and heavy, upon the cities of the plain, but basks perpetually in the pure, unclouded sun-light of heaven. The symbol of the Divine presence is in her midst—a pillar of cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night; and, being thus made luminous in the Lord, she stands a moral *pharos* on the hill-top—a genuine “light-house” in the midst of nature's darkness! In her relation to the *past*, she is a miracle of grace—a standing monument of God's mercy and love—the fairest trophy of “the truth as it is in Jesus”—the accumulated sum and evi-

dence of its saving power—and the joy of the Redeemer's heart. She is emphatically the *pillar* of the truth. In her relation to the *future*, the Church is the hope of the world—the genuine, true, and only *infallible* conservator of human society. She is the mystic “woman” who receives from the bountiful hand of her Lord the leaven of eternal life, and mingles it in with the shattered elements of a fallen, sinning, dying world, to arrest the process of its ruin, and to restore it to God, and to eternal life and felicity. From these remarks on the city of God—the home of the redeemed—the refuge of penitents—the hospital of the diseased—it is evident that she is, in the deepest and most real sense, “the pillar and ground of the truth.”

But, in the second place, the high distinction of the Church is proven by her efficient character or calling. She is, by divine right and appointment, the *Depositary and Guardian* of the truth—to whom are committed “the oracles of God.” Paul, in allusion to Israel, says: “What advantage, then, hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly because, that unto them—the Jews—were committed the oracles of God.” And even their unfaithfulness did not invalidate this appointment. The care and keeping of family treasures are not usually committed to strangers; nor is it left to the uncertainty and precariousness of mere chance to provide for their safe keeping; much less are they entrusted to the perilous guardianship of openly avowed and professed enemies. They are put into a place of security, under lock and key, and these deposited in safe hands. So Jesus Christ says: “On this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto *you*”—chosen and attested heralds of the cross—“the keys of the kingdom of heaven”—the symbols of authority and stewardship. Hence Paul says: “Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.”

This is one item in the Divine Economy, and the wisdom of this arrangement is seen in the extraordinary care and solici-

tude with which the Church has always guarded these inestimable treasures. Every student of history knows how sacredly and with what pious care she concealed the word and sacraments from the rude gaze and profane touch of the infuriate pagans, who maliciously watched for the destruction of the one, and the profanation of the other. It is well known with what inconceivable labor and painful solicitude, she had the sacred books—the holy Bible—transcribed, and, in order to secure them from being plundered, she piously chained them to her altars. When afterwards the art of printing was discovered, she diligently labored to multiply copies of it, and to circulate them among her children, until, in our day, the entire Christian world is supplied with copies of the book of life. In view of this important service rendered to her beloved children, by the Church, she deserves eminently to be called “the pillar and ground of the truth.”

AGAIN: the Church is appointed to preach the everlasting Gospel and administer its sealing ordinances. “And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying: All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth: go ye, therefore, and teach (disciple) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world;” or, as St. Mark has it: “Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.” The solemnity and importance of this commission are seen in the circumstances attending the Apostles’ inauguration in their sacred office. On the evening of His resurrection, “being the first day of the week,” the disciples were assembled for public worship, and Jesus came and stood in their midst, and said unto them, “Peace be unto you; and when He had so said He showed unto them His hands and His side; and the disciples were glad when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on

them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them: and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." And immediately before His ascension to heaven He once more said unto them: "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." So runs the Redeemer's promise: the verification follows soon after. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them: and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Such was the solemn inauguration of the heralds of the cross, when sent forth to preach the gospel and administer its sealing ordinances. They were the divinely commissioned and divinely qualified bearers of life and salvation to the nations—the official organs of "the House of God, which is the Church of the living God, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH." Without her agency, as thus arranged by the Lord Himself, the gospel of the grace of God could neither have been securely guarded and preserved nor preached among the nations, nor could the holy sacraments have been rightly dispensed, and so the kingdom of God extended and established in the earth.

We observe again, that the Church, and she *alone*, has the guarantee of Christ's presence, and of the guidance of the Holy Ghost. Instruments for the conservation and spread of the gospel were in due time appointed by the Lord and qualified for their important work; and when at length He had given them the great commission, He added: "And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." A blessed assurance; and for what purpose was this promise given? Undoubtedly to sustain the faith of His servants in the prosecution of their arduous and responsible work. They—the Apostles—were the

laborers, the builders, the cultivators of the soil; but Christ Himself by His presence and power sustained the instruments and gave efficiency and success to their commission—their efforts to build up the Church. He is the strength of His saints. “For where two or three are gathered together in My name,” says Christ, “there am I in the midst of them.” In every Christian assembly, in every church council—in every department of His moral vineyard, is Jesus found, “walking in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks”—the expressive symbol of God’s holy Church Catholic. And then to complete and render absolutely effective the means of their support, and to guarantee to them ample success in their important work, He promises them the uninterrupted guidance of the Holy Ghost.

Highly significant and instructive is the assurance given to His Apostles by our Divine Redeemer: “Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you.” He had indeed carefully instructed them in “the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven.” He had time and again corrected their misapprehensions of the truth, and in every possible way sought to instruct them in the doctrines and practices of our holy religion; but all this was not sufficient to secure them, and the church in coming ages, against fatal aberrations from the truth; and hence, when He was about to leave them, He, in the way of a parting gift, said: “I will not leave you comfortless”—orphans—“I will come to you” again. “And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter”—*παράκλητος*, counsellor—“that He may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the WORLD cannot receive.” Again: “These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you: but the COMFORTER, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, HE shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.” And again: “When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you,” from the Father, “HE shall testify of me. And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with Me from the beginning.” And then He concludes: “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now: howbeit, when

He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth."

Now, observe in reference to these promises of divine guidance, that they are all made *exclusively* to the Church, and that the Spirit's presence with the Church is to be *perpetual*. Hear what our great High-priest saith: "I will pray the Father, and He shall give YOU"—the holy Apostles, and the Church, whose organs they are—"Another Comforter, that He may abide with you FOREVER, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it knoweth Him not; but YE know Him, for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."

And this Divine guide is to *teach* the ministry, or, if you prefer it, the whole body of believers, and to bring *all* things to their remembrance, whatsoever Christ has taught them. He is to testify of Christ, and to guide His Church into all truth.

Here then, is the *basis* of our faith in the Church's stability, and of our confidence strong and firm, in the ultimate and complete triumph of the truth in her hands. In our doubts and perplexities we look with joyous confidence to this tower of strength—the CHURCH, "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone"—assured that in her peaceful palaces, "God is found for a refuge," and that we shall always find succor and support in communion with Him who is her glorious and ever-living Head. "For we have not an high-priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Other and inferior priests have lived, and labored, and died; "but this man hath an unchangeable priesthood," says Paul, "wherefore He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them."

And should we ever be challenged for the evidence of His extraordinary history—of His incarnation, birth and life of obedience,—of His death and resurrection—of His ascension to heaven and exaltation at the right hand of God,—should we ever be so challenged, we shall at once confidently point the proud scoffer to Zion, the "city of our God," and tell him

there, sir, there is the evidence for "the truth as it is in Jesus." Just as our own noble Republic is the very best, strongest, and most comprehensive evidence for the continued existence and prevalence of those great *political* principles, for which our brave and virtuous ancestors lived, and bled, and died, so *precisely* also is "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth"—the living body of believers—the very best, strongest, and most comprehensive evidence for the great *Spiritual* principles contained in her ancient and venerable Creeds and heroically confessed and defended by a long and brilliant line of her noble martyrs, confessors, and saints, shining down through the ages like a stream of fire! "Glorious things are spoken of Zion, the city of God." She is the perfection of beauty—the joy of the whole earth—the prop and stay of society! In the beautiful palaces of yonder "City," perched upon the "hill of God," are the living, moving, imperishable records of our *faith and hope*; and in her massive walls and luminous towers are the "tested" guarantees of the world's redemption. On her bloody banner, waving high and triumphant over the shattered works of a dying world, stands the ancient and abiding motto: "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." And, down over its shining battlements, come the mellowed voices of ten thousand times ten thousand saints—each wearing a crown of gold—saying: "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father—to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever: Amen."

Such is the character and such are the inhabitants of "the city of our God"—the New Jerusalem. No wonder that the aged and venerable Paul, the Apostle of Christ and Champion of His cause, should have manifested so much and such deep concern about his beloved Timothy and his conduct in "the House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." And we also, "as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God," should manifest at least an equal concern for the purity of the Church and the consistency of her children.

Let me then, beloved fathers and brethren in the ministry, and all ye who are "called to be saints," state yet, in conclusion and by way of personal application, some few things in reference to the conduct which becomes us respectively in "the House of God," whether as office-bearers or private members simply, but especially as "ministers of Christ." Your own sense of duty and Christian propriety will readily suggest to your minds the things most eminently becoming "the ambassadors of God"—the heralds of the cross. Hence it is not at all necessary to detain the readers with many words. Each one can best judge for himself, after what has already been said, what is required of us as the servants of Christ. I shall, therefore, simply state and briefly illustrate such points as the Epistle itself suggests.

FIRST,—We should be "sound in the faith," (1 Tim. iii. 9), and also "blameless in life" (1 Tim. iii. 2-7); both these items are necessary "that the Word of God be not blasphemed." For, if it be true, as we know it is, that our practical life and conduct are the legitimate fruit of our religious principles—our faith—then we see at once how infinitely important it is that we should be sound at heart—"holding the mystery of the Faith in a pure conscience," and so endeavoring also to "keep the heart with all diligence, since out of it are the issues of life." And if it be true also, that our principles and the cause we espouse will be judged by the conduct which we exhibit, then we can see also why it is so highly important to the cause of Christ, that we, and each of us who are its defenders and promulgators, should be "vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach, not given to wine; no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre, not a brawler, not covetous, one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; not a novice, lest, being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil." Such is the picture drawn by the pen of divine inspiration, of a genuine Christian bishop—a servant of Christ. "As ye have, therefore, received Christ Jesus, the Lord, so walk ye in Him,

rooted and built up in Him, and established in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving."

SECONDLY,—We should be faithful, earnest and persevering in the discharge of our respective duties, both as pastors and members of the flock. Diligence in the prosecution of our work, and obedience, ready and cheerful, to all God's commands, united with meekness and simplicity, will accomplish wonders. Hence the earnest entreaty of St. Paul: "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority—that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty; for this is good, and acceptable in the sight of God, our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." This salvation of men is to be effected instrumentally by honest and Christian consistency. But especially as office-bearers and in an official way are we to show ourselves faithful and diligent, and so effective in building up God's kingdom, and the maintenance of the truth. Hear the Apostle's solemn charge to his son Timothy; "I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and kingdom, preach the word, be instant in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." And again: "Watch thou in all things; endure afflictions; do the work of an evangelist; make full proof of thy ministry." And here the aged hero—the successful champion of the cross, full of honors, and borne down by the weight of years—inflamed with love, and burning with zeal for his Master's cause—rises to an inestimable majesty, and urges onward the young and inexperienced Timothy by his own glorious example, and by the nearness of his own approaching dissolution. "For I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing."

THIRDLY,—We should be deeply concerned for the continuance, purity, and efficiency of the holy ministry. Much of the Church's prosperity and efficiency will depend on the character of her official organs. Hence the Apostle's exhortation: "These things command and teach. Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity.—Till I come, give attention to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear unto all." And then: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things, without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality. Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins; keep thyself pure." Again: "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing, which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us."—"And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."—"Consider what I say, and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." St. Paul was himself a faithful minister of Christ, and, by his zeal and fidelity, maintained the dignity of the CHURCH—"the pillar and ground of the truth,"—and by earnest efforts also, he sought to leave behind him, after his decease, a band of faithful men, as his successors in the holy office. OUR duty also is, not only, to be faithful and true to our high calling in Christ Jesus, but to see to it that there may always be a succession of "good men and true," to have charge of "the mystery of God," when we are gone!

FOURTHLY,—We should diligently cultivate the entire garden of the Lord; removing the evil and cherishing what is good and useful. This duty belongs to all Christians, but more particularly so to the officers or ministers of the Church. They are set for the defence of the gospel, for the promulgation of the

truth, for the encouragement of the sincere and penitent, for the comfort of saints, and for the correction of the disobedient and perverse. "And, if we are thus true to our high and holy calling, if we contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," and if, in the discharge of our solemn obligations, we neglect neither ourselves nor others, the Lord Himself will graciously assist us in our "labor of love and work of faith," and, in the day of Christ's coming, many precious souls shall be given to us, to serve as abiding seals to our ministry, and to shine as stars in the crown of our rejoicing. May all those, therefore, who are called to minister at the altar, so live and so demean themselves as becometh those that are counted worthy to be servants in "THE HOUSE OF GOD, WHICH IS THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH."

ART. VI.—THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT IN THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED CHURCHES.

By CHAS. P. KRAUTH, D.D.,

Norton Professor of Theology in the E. L. Theological Seminary in Philadelphia,
and Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in the University of
Pennsylvania.

THE great body of intelligent Presbyterian clergymen in this country is, we believe, either passive on the question of a liturgy, or in various degrees favorable to the use of Church forms, with a certain degree of freedom. The Presbyterian Church is, indeed, in its earlier history, as completely committed to the general principle of a Liturgy as either the Anglican or Lutheran Church. The facts of that history have been brought out in several recent works from Presbyterian hands.* The most valuable of them is the book by Dr. Shields.

* 1. *Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies: Historical Sketches.* By a Minister of the Presbyterian Church. "And this I speak," &c. 1 Cor. vii. 35. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1855. 12mo. pp. 260.

2. A book of public prayer. Compiled from the authorized formularies of worship

It is indeed one of the most interesting and important liturgical works which have appeared for a long time. It is a welcome evidence how truth re-asserts her rights, and overcomes the deepest prejudices. From one of the most finished scholars in the Presbyterian Church, which is so rich in such men; from Princeton, that old fortress of the Calvinistic faith; from a professor in Nassau Hall, among the standard bearers in a great host, comes this important work, testifying to one great, fundamental, practical principle of the Reformation, on which the Calvinists stood as firmly as the Lutherans, to wit, that a fixed order of service best comported with the public worship of God, and was best adapted to the edification of His people. The book which Dr. Shields edits is an adaptation of the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England to the doctrines and preferences of the Presbyterian Church. It is executed in that pure taste which distinguishes everything which comes from the hands of its gifted author; and we hope it will in various ways work usefully in the Presbyterian Church. Distinct from the Prayer Book, yet closely connected with it, is a historical appendix: "*Liturgia Expurgata*; or the Prayer Book Amended, according to the Presbyterian Revision of 1661, and historically and critically reviewed." This liturgical history is singularly rich in the fruits of a wide range of investigation. It brings together as we have never seen them brought together before, the materials for a judgment as to the real attitude of the Presbyterian Church to the liturgical question. But it does more than this. It is a moderate and qualified, yet very powerful plea for the use of a liturgical directory. The chapters on ministerial and congregational neglects in

of the Presbyterian Church, as prepared by the Reformers Calvin, Knox, Bucoer and others. With supplementary forms. New York: Chas. Scribner. 1857. 12mo. pp. xxiii. 360.

3. (*A Manual of Worship, suitable to be used in Legislative and other public bodies, in the army, &c.* Compiled from the forms and in accordance with the common usages of all Christian denominations, &c. Philadelphia: George W. Childs. 1862. 18mo. pp.).

4. *The Book of Common Prayer, as amended by the Westminster Divines, A. D. 1661.* Edited by Charles W. Shields, D.D. With a historical and liturgical treatise. Philadelphia: James S. Claxton. 1867. 12mo. pp. xxiv. 637. 188.

public worship are admirable; and indeed the whole book is so worthy of attentive perusal, that we can only say that we hope none of our readers interested in the great liturgical questions of the day will fail to read Dr. Shields' work for themselves. We must venture, however, to express a modest dissent from Dr. Shields on one or two historical points, in which the Lutheran Church is concerned. In his desire of making out the "Book of Common Prayer" as thoroughly Calvinistic as possible, we think he has been unconsciously biassed in his views. It is acknowledged by all who are familiar with the history of the Episcopal Liturgy, that it owes a large part of its beauty and fullness to the "Consultation" which was drawn up in 1543 by Melancthon and Bucer, by invitation of Hermann, Bishop of Cologne.* This Lutheran liturgy Dr. Shields is inclined to claim as in some sort Calvinistic ("with a bias toward Calvinism"), and in this we are compelled to regard him as mistaken. The *liturgy* of Cologne is simply and purely Lutheran.

1. Melancthon and Bucer were both Lutherans. However mild, irenical, and even unionistic they might be, they were both adherents of the Augsburg Confession, declaring that they held it from the heart as their faith. Bucer signed the Augsburg Confession in 1532. In the Wittenberg Concord of 1536, Bucer came to a full concord with Luther in the faith, even to the last point of contest, "that the unworthy truly take the body and blood of Christ, though to their own judgment." At the consummation of this Concord, Bucer and Capito shed tears of joy. "From the year 1536," says Diefenbach, "Bucer was thoroughly Lutheran;" and Schenkel, who would gladly have reached another conclusion, says: "That in the Wittenberg Concord, Bucer ceased to hold his earlier conviction, that he was overcome by Luther's authority, and that his zeal for union carried him away to the recantation of the Swiss doctrine, is a fact which no sophistry can set aside."

* 1. Hermann's einfältige bedencken, &c. Anno A. D. xliiii. (Marpurg durch Anthonium Tirolt). 4to. Fol. cxxii. (In the Library of the writer).

2. Richter: Kirchenordnung. xvi. Cent. No. lxxxii.

(Herzog, Real Enc. art. Bucer). The most violent feeling was aroused against Bucer among the Reformed on the Continent, and he was styled in bitter sarcasm: "Luther's Cardinal a latere."

Lathbury shows that Bucer was the object of intense hatred to many of the Calvinists in England, because of his adherence to the doctrine (to use Bucer's own words) of "the real and substantial presence of Christ in the Sacrament," in which doctrine he remained steadfast to his death. Guericke says: "Bucer went to England, and even there held firmly to the pure Evangelical" (Lutheran) "doctrine; deeply deploring its imperilling by the rationalizing tendency which prevailed." In 1587, among the "Doctors and preachers who subscribed the Augsburg Confession and its apology," appears the name of Martin Bucer, attached to the Appendix to the Smalcald Articles. Melancthon says to Luther (1548), "Both Bucer and Pistorius teach purely and rightly."*

That Melancthon and Bucer were on terms of personal friendship with Calvin, no more proves them to be Calvinists than our hearty admiration of Dr. Shields makes us a Calvinist. Calvin never praised either of them as ardently as he did Luther; and it is pretty well settled that Luther was not a Calvinist—although more largely than many imagine Calvin was a Lutheran. The other laborers in the Cologne Reformation were all Lutherans. Hedio,† was the pupil of Melancthon, the personal friend of Luther, and preacher and professor of Theology in the Lutheran city, Strassburg. Pistorius was the Lutheran pastor of Nidde, in Ober Hesse. Sarczer was one of the great Lutheran theologians.

2. Luther never made any objection to the *Liturgy* of Cologne. Luther read hastily only so much of the Consultation as referred to this one point, of the Lord's Supper, with his mind in a general state of excitement from recent assaults on the part of the Zuinglians. He objected simply and solely to the *ambiguity* of certain phrases in the doctrinal statements in

* Corp. Ref. v. 112.

† Corp. Ref. v. 150.

regard to the Lord's Supper, which are wholly distinct from the Liturgy. Luther's own form of service was the basis of it, and of its whole class of liturgies, and its immediate sources were, mainly: first, the Brandenburg-Nuremburg Liturgy of 1533, and, secondly, the Saxon of 1539; both of which belong to the greatest and most widely used Lutheran liturgies of the Sixteenth century. Its third source is the Cassel order of 1589, also Lutheran. The doctrinal portion of it was prepared in part only by Melancthon. What relates to the Lord's Supper was written by Bucer. Luther was speedily satisfied with Melancthon's defence of his own cause, and two years after, Bucer's fuller statement of his doctrine of the Sacrament brought about a reconciliation with Luther.

3. The Liturgy of Cologne, in its whole character, is distinctively Lutheran.

Its formularies are Lutheran; the Baptismal prayer and rite, for example, are from Luther's *Taufbuchlein*; its order of private baptism is from the Saxon service of 1539; its exhortation at Communion, and Collects, from the Nuremburg of 1533; its Litany is Luther's translation and adaptation, and the Litany Collects are just as he prepared and arranged them.

When, on page 102, Dr. Shields gives the new and beautiful parts of the Litany which he thinks "*due to Bucer*," he simply quotes Luther's Litany, which is transferred to the Cologne Order.*

* The Cologne Litany in our copy (1544) is verbatim that of Luther, with these exceptions:

LUTHER.	COLOGNE.
Sohn	Sun (misprint)
Blut	Blutvergiessung
By thy cross and death	omits (probably misprint)
all his Enemies.	all God's Enemies.

The Cologne adds these Collects to the Litany:

1. O God, merciful Father, who despiest not the sighing of a contrite heart; or, Luther's first Latin Litany Collect. First in Church of England series. Third in the Church Book
2. Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who desirest not the death of a sinner; or, Luther's first German Litany Collect. Third Latin. First in Church Book.
3. Almighty God, who knowest us to be set in the midst of so many and great dangers. Luther's Fourth Latin Collect. Fourth in the Church Book.

4. In those very respects in which Calvinism most vehemently and characteristically is arrayed against Lutheranism, it is anti-Calvinistic and Lutheran. It retains, for instance, exorcism (stripped of its superstitions) in Baptism, the renunciation of the Devil; it enjoins the making of the Cross on the brow and breast of the child; it allows the singing of Psalms in Latin; it has antiphons and responses throughout; retaining the rite of Confirmation, private Confession and Absolution, the singing of the Creed, the Preface in the Communion, the Sanctus and Benedictus; the singing of the words of the Institution by the minister—whom it constantly calls the priest, the Agnus Dei, the Old Testament Benediction. In fact, it is one of the amplest and most carefully arranged Lutheran liturgies of its century. We are almost sorry that a book which has so largely influenced Dr. Shields' liturgical offering to his church has so much on which thorough Calvinists of the old type will look with more than suspicion.

5. There has been hardly a diversity of opinion as to where Hermann's Liturgy belongs. All the older writers place it among the Lutheran liturgies.

Hilles, in a letter to Bullinger (June 4, 1549), says: "We have a uniform Communion service throughout the whole kingdom, after the manner of the Nuremburg and Saxon Churches. The bishop and magistrates put no stumbling-block in the way of the Lutherans."*

Melancthon, in writing to Luther (May 19, 1548), says: "That the Bishop (Hermann) had commanded that the formula of doctrine and of rites shall be conformed to that of Nuremburg." (Corp. Ref. v. 112.) "It agrees with (that of) our churches." Do. 160.

Proctor† says of "The Prayer Book of Edward VI," "Some of the more extreme faction of the Reformers found fault with it, on the ground that it was tinged with Lutheranism." "Of all the foreigners who were engaged in the work of Ref-

* Original Letters (Parker Society), CXXI.

† History of Book of Common Prayer. Cambridge. 1860. pp. 26, 38, 39 and 40.

ormation, Melancthon and Luther had the greatest influence in the composition of the English Book of Common Prayer. The first book was largely indebted to Luther, who had composed a form of service in 1533. The Litany" [which was Luther's] "presents many striking affinities with the amended English Litany of 1554. The exhortations in the Communion Service (1548 and 1549), and portions of the Baptismal Services, are mainly due to this book (Hermann's), through which the influence of Luther may be traced in our Prayer Book, where additions or considerable changes were made in translating the old Latin services." Proctor points out more than thirty particulars in which this book influenced the Book of Common Prayer. Lathbury says: "All our Reformers were united in bonds of amity with the Lutherans, and had the "Confession of Augsburg," and the "Simple Consultation of Hermann," before them: the former in preparing the Articles, the latter in compiling the Book of Common Prayer."

Daniel* not only places it among Lutheran Liturgies, but in a note upon its baptismal service, directs attention to the prevailing character of the Calvinistic Service in contrast with this thoroughly Lutheran Service of Cologne. Even Dr. Shields seems to furnish evidence against his own position, when, to prove that it was "compiled from *Reformed* as well as Lutheran sources," he says in his note, "from the Formularies of Nuremberg (Lutheran), Saxony (Lutheran), Strassburg (Reformed), and Hesse (Reformed)," for, in the first place, the Formularies of Nuremberg and Saxony were overwhelmingly predominant, and in the second place, Strassburg and Hesse were, in 1543, not Reformed, but Lutheran. Hesse did not become Calvinistic till 1604, and even after the change, retained a decidedly Lutheranizing liturgy. Nor is the statement correct that Hesse furnished materials for the Cologne Liturgy: the relation was exactly the reverse. Strassburg received the Augsburg Confession in 1532, and never became Calvinistic.

6. Dr. Shields is mistaken in saying "it was never used nor

* Codex Liturgicus, Vol. II. x, and p. 202.

sanctioned in any Lutheran community." It was one of the sources of the Austrian Agenda of 1571, and was for some considerable time in use in Hesse.* Its chief sources, the Nuremberg and Saxon Orders, were the most influential and widely used of the Lutheran Liturgies of the Sixteenth century.

7. The chief objection to it from Lutheran sources—made not against the liturgical parts, but against its polity and spirit, was not that it had a Calvinistic bearing, but that it was not sufficiently marked in its anti-Romish features.†

In "Eutaxia" is given a history of the Calvinistic Liturgies, and in the "Book of Public Prayer," is presented a number of the forms that have been authorized in the Reformed Churches. Both works have been prepared with much care, and are very valuable to the Student of Liturgies.

"ORDER OF WORSHIP" IN THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH.

The most recent movements in the German Reformed Church,‡ for such we are compelled still to call it, to avoid

* Richter, K. O. II. 30.

† Seckendorf. B. III. 437.

‡ 1. Psalms and Hymns, for the use of the German Reformed Church in the United States of America. Published by the Synod of the said Church. 1854. 57th edit. 1869. Philadelphia: 18mo. pp. 636.

2. A Liturgy; or order of Christian worship. Prepared and published by the direction and for the use of the German Reformed Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1858. 8vo. pp. 340. 68.

3. The Liturgical Question, with reference to the provisional Liturgy of the German Reformed Church. A report by the "Liturgical Committee." Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1862. 12mo. pp. iv. 72.

4. An Order of Worship for the Reformed Church. Philadelphia: S. R. Fisher & Co. 1867. 8vo. pp. 388.

5. The Revised Liturgy. A History and Criticism of the Ritualistic movement in the German Reformed Church. By J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Rodgers. 1867. 12mo. pp. 120.

6. Vindication of the Revised Liturgy, Historical and Theological. By the Rev. J. W. Nevin, D.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Rodgers. 1867. 8vo. pp. 93.

7. Reformed, not Ritualistic. A reply to Dr. Nevin's "Vindication," &c. By J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Rodgers. 1867. 8vo. pp. 156.

8. Liturgical Discussion. Answer to Professor Dörner. By John W. Nevin, D.D., Lancaster, Pa. From the "Mercersburg Review" for October, 1868. Phila.: S. R. Fisher & Co. 1868. 8vo. pp. 115.

confusion, find their centre in the "Order of Worship," published in 1867. A summary of its contents may be useful as a clue to what we would say about it. Its matter is embraced in XXIII Divisions.

I. It commences with the Church Festivals—how to find the time of their occurrence; table of movable festivals from 1867 to 1890.

II. Table of Scripture lessons for all the Sundays in the year.

III. The Regular Service of the Lord's Day. The order of service is as follows: 1. Sentence, said by the minister at the "right of the altar," all standing. 2. Exhortation to Confession. 3. Confession (all kneeling). 4. "Declaration of pardon," minister alone standing. 5. Apostles' Creed, congregation joining in it. 6. Versicle—Minister and people. 7. Gloria in Excelsis, "sung, chanted, or recited." 8. Gospel. 9. Epistle; adding, as the minister may see fit, "other portions of Scripture." 10. Gloria Patri, between the minister and people. 11. Salutation and response. 12. Collect for day. 13. General Prayer or Festival Prayer—in Lent, &c., the Litany. The General Prayer is composed of Collects. 14. Psalm or Hymn. 15. Sermon. 16. Two Collects; Lord's Prayer, in which the people join aloud. 17. Collection and announcements. 18. Psalm or hymn, with doxology. 19. Apostolic Benediction.

IV. The Evening Service is substantially in the same order as the Morning Service.

V. The Litany, which is for the most part after that of the Church of England.

VI. Prayers and Thanksgivings for special occasions.

VII. The Gospels, Epistles and Collects. In addition to the Collect, each Church Festival has two special prayers adapted to it. On Trinity Sunday the *Te Deum* is to be chanted or recited antiphonally before the sermon. The Gospels and Epistles are printed in full.

VIII. The Preparatory Service to the Holy Communion begins with: 1. A Sentence. 2. The Ten Commandments.

3. Response by the people, "Lord have mercy upon us," &c. 4. Prayer. 5. Litany—all kneeling. 6. Psalm or hymn. 7. Sermon. 8. Exhortation at the altar—occupying four pages. 9. Confession and Declaration of Pardon—nearly two pages. 10. Doxology. 11. Benediction.

IX. The Communion Service itself is as follows: 1. Sentence. 2. Confession. 3. Nicene Creed. 4. Gloria in Excelsis. 5. Gospel and Epistle. 6. Versicles and Prayer. 7. Psalm or hymn. 8. Sermon, "or lesson of moderate length," from the Holy Gospels, on the history of Christ's passion and death. 9. Collection of offerings for the poor, during which Scripture sentences are read. 10. Prayer. 11. Selection of passages from the Holy Scriptures. 12. The Preface paraphrased, and ending with 13, the Sanctus—in which the people join aloud. 14. Words of institution. 15. Prayer, consisting of ten Collects, and closing with the Lord's Prayer. 16. The Pax. 17. The Distribution—"while a sacramental hymn is sung." 18. Prayer. 19. The Te Deum—said or chanted antiphonally. 20. The Benediction. We have then the services of Baptism, Confirmation, Marriage, Ordination and Installation, Excommunication and Restoration, the Visitation and Communion of the Sick, Burial of the Dead, Service to be used at Sea, Reception of Immigrants, Laying of a Corner-Stone, Consecration of a Church, Consecration of a Burial Ground, Order of Scripture Readings for the Family, Prayers for the Family, and, finally, forty-five Canticles, Psalms, and Ancient Hymns.

The mere table of contents of the book testifies to the industry with which it has been prepared. The authors of the book have evidently examined, with great care, the most important liturgies of the entire Christian Church. The material they have accumulated is very rich; and if the German Reformed Church wins for herself the treasure of a true liturgy, the great body of the labor performed in the preparation of this book will not have been passed through in vain.

Its authors have avoided the rock on which the purely Calvinistic liturgies have struck; to wit, that a liturgy was to be composed, not compiled. This book of service is not composed

of the effusions of the rhetoric or theology of the present hour; but in the main is drawn from the great historic sources. Another great excellence in it is that it is thoroughly responsive; the Christian people are restored to the exercise of their precious right to have a direct share in every part of the service. The influence of this Liturgy for good, if it be fairly tried, will be incalculable.

We should not do our part as an honest critic if we did not frankly state in what respects we think the book capable of improvement. First of all, there is a tendency to too great an accumulation of material; the forms are too long; and, in some cases, the didactic element somewhat overcrowds the devotional, and the pith of noble things is concealed by paraphrase. There are, too, some defects in the arrangement. The Creed is in an abnormal position, just before the Gloria. The Gospel, as higher than the Epistle, should follow it in a service which rises as it advances, as every true service does. There are various subjective changes in the Collects, Litany, and other forms which grate upon us; and the general and wise subordination of the services to the usages of the Church of the past, renders the occasional deviations from them, on insufficient ground, so far as we can see, objectionable. It would be a great addition to the devotional force of the Liturgy if the responsive parts were *sung* by the people, instead of being said, and for this there is good Reformed authority.

Neither the merits nor defects of a liturgy can be tested, except by actual use. If the German Reformed Church will take this Liturgy, and thoroughly test it, by a continued use, she will put herself in a position in which she can prove every thing in it; and while its defects will be made more and more apparent, its many unquestionable beauties and excellencies will endear it more and more to the Church; and thus in the final Liturgy of the future she will have all its gold with no alloy.

In connection with the "Order of Worship"—and the movements which culminated in it, there has been and is yet, a controversy in the German Reformed Church, in which it is

not only the right but the duty of every Christian thinker in our land to feel a deep interest. For the importance of a battle is to be determined neither by the size of the field on which it is fought, nor by the number of combatants it brings out, but by the greatness of the principles it involves, and of the issues it settles. The liturgical struggle in the German Reformed Church is one in which all Protestantism is interested; for it is not a mere battle between two parties, but a struggle between two principles; and it is carried on with an ability which gives promise that the result will be felt, beyond the bounds of the communion in which it originates. Neither side of the question has been more ably argued, at a recent date, than by the two gentlemen, Drs. Nevin and Bomberger, who by common consent, are accepted as pre-eminently representative men in the two tendencies. The issue is not at all (upon the surface, at least), between Liturgy and no Liturgy. Both sides profess, alike, to be liturgical. The real question, therefore is, granting that a Liturgy ought to be, what ought it to be, especially in the German Reformed Church?

The whole characteristic movement of Dr. Nevin and his co-laborers has been toward placing the German Reformed Church of this country on a broader basis of Catholicity, as to its doctrine and life, in both of which, at the time of the Mercersburg reaction, it had, as Dr. Bomberger freely admits, greatly departed from its standards and landmarks. Too comprehensive, independent, and vigorous as a thinker, too deeply read in the history of the Church, and too large-hearted himself to sympathize with the sectarian tendency which is the special weakness of the Reformed type of Protestantism, Dr. Nevin has nobly labored to lift into his own loftier sphere the denomination with which he cast in his lot. His labors have not been in vain. To observers, outside of the German Reformed Church, he and his school seem to have saved it. He has in conjunction with a number of men who have wrought in great general unity of spirit with him, breathed into the German Reformed Church a new life; he has created a theological school, he has infused an ardor of investigation into the noblest young minds in the min-

istry of his Church. Dr. Bomberger himself says: "He has long been regarded as an almost unerring oracle. We have been accustomed to pay well nigh unquestioning deference to his opinions." Those who are most remote from concurrence with Dr. Nevin's views acknowledge him to be the very soul of candor and integrity. It is sometimes made a complaint, by Dr. Nevin's readers, that he is not always easy to follow. This difficulty is, for the most part, the result of the recondite nature of his themes, of his depth of thought, and of that thorough mastery of the modern German philosophy in which probably no native-born American is his equal, which makes him move with such ease to himself in it that he is hardly conscious of the requirements of those who have not had his training. His ardor of thought, and his absorption in his discussion, occasionally produce a relative negligence of style; and from our Lutheran point of view he seems to us, sometimes, to run into a perplexity which is the inevitable result of the Calvinistic groundwork on which, in some part, he still rests. He is a writer of a high order, rich in matter, and skillful in form, with almost every kind of excellence at his command. He knows how to grapple with falsehood, with the inflexible hand of logic; can meet folly with that playful rebuke which it dreads more than the severest reproof, and can overwhelm malevolent assumption and falsehood with the raciest wit and keenest sarcasm. Though he has, for the most part, addressed theological thinkers, he has yet shown the power of reaching the hearts of the people. His "Liturgical Question" is an admirable plea for a true Liturgy, to the people as well as to the clergy. It is a genuine *Concio ad populum* as well as a *Concio ad clerum*.

It is no easy matter to find an opponent able to cope with such a writer as Dr. Nevin, but we think the friends of Dr. Bomberger cannot deny that he has done the best the case allowed, for his cause and for them. Highly esteemed as a Christian gentleman, and a faithful pastor, not unknown in the literary world, as the editor of a translation of an abridgment of part of Herzog's Cyclopaedia and of Kurtz's Church History, promi-

nent in the councils of his Church, and as a member of the Liturgical Committee, Dr. Bomberger has been looked to with confidence, as a standard-bearer, by the opponents of the tendency represented by Dr. N. Dr. B. has justified this confidence by his great activity and industry as a controversialist. He has shown untiring purpose and skill in putting his points; he has been careful in guarding his own positions, eagle-eyed in seeing the weak points of the other side, and unsparing in the exposure of them. His style is clear and easy, popular, even in its leading defect, which is that of a certain pulpit diffuseness, and if his army be beaten it will have no right to complain that its misfortunes are the result of bad generalship.

As it is agreed, on both sides, that a Liturgy is desirable, as Dr. B., himself, for years earnestly advocated the preparation of one,* the question may be asked, on what do the two parties divide? We reply, in general, that a large part of the question may be said to be one between the Altar and the Pulpit. These Apostles, or rather their friends, have fallen out by the way, disputing which shall be the greater. Romanism degrades the pulpit, to exalt the altar; Puritanism (which is the extravagance of Calvinism) ignores the altar, to magnify the pulpit. Lutheranism gives to both their due and co-ordinate place, not as rivals, but as brethren and servants of the Lord and of His people. Dr. Bomberger's position is that of a *reserved*, not an unqualified Puritanism, and is like all half-way positions, internally self-contradictory; while Dr. Nevin's view is composite, largely Lutheran, with two polar tendencies so nearly of like force as practically to balance and neutralize each other—the one Romanistic (not Romish), the other Calvinistic, in Calvin's own personal sense. His liturgy, and his views of liturgies, are *eclectic*, and that is part of their strength, and, in our judgment, no inconsiderable part of their weakness. The altar, to be truly such, must be associated with faith in the peculiar presence of the Lord; there must be a sacrament of the altar, to give a centre to the offering of praise and prayer: "The

* Revised Liturgy, 65.

last ground," says Dr. N.,* "of all true Christian worship, is the mystical presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist—all the parts of public worship are inwardly bound together by their having a common relation to the idea of a Christian altar." On this point, Dr. N's. remarks are peculiarly fine, and their force is diminished only by what we regard as inadequate views of that mystical presence itself. On this conception of the altar, the new Liturgy of the German Reformed Church is built, upon an apprehension, not entirely logical in its mode, but nevertheless real and vivid that there is a sacramental reality, a supernatural communion, in which Christ gives to us, in some sense and way, not of the world, His broken body and shed blood. On this point, Dr. B. charges the Revised Liturgy with presenting "at least, a modified ubiquitarianism."†

Another question is, how is the ministry to be regarded? Does it embody and represent the universal priesthood of believers? Is there any real sense in which a minister is a priest, in which every believer is not?

Another question is, whether the church year is to be maintained in its integrity. Another, whether there is to be an active participation by the people, in attitude and by responses.

On all these points the views contended for by Dr. Nevin, and opposed by Dr. Bomberger, are relatively in affinity with those of the Lutheran Church. Dr. Nevin's argument upon the main points touching them is simply irresistible and unanswerable. In saying that all Dr. B's. efforts to overthrow Dr. N's. points, simply on the general merits of the question are an utter failure, we mean no disparagement of his skill or ability. If he and his antagonist could change sides, we think that however masterly Dr. N's. defence of an untenable position might be, he would be compelled to abandon it. If the church is to have a Liturgy at all, Dr. N. is undoubtedly right in his general position as to what that Liturgy should be.

But with the question, what is the best sort of Liturgy? arises another—whether the best sort of Liturgy, as Dr. N.

* Liturgical Question, p. 23.

† Revised Liturgy, p. 105.

justly regards it, is such as the German Reformed Church of the past has had. On this point Drs. N. and B. do not radically differ. Dr. N. does not deny that the friends of the new Liturgy "propose to themselves something more than the reproduction, simply, of any older Liturgy of the Reformed Church, something more than a mere compilation of offices and forms, modeled on the plan of these liturgies generally."* Dr. Nevin makes admissions which he must have been sure would be used against him. Indeed, his mistake is likely to be, that in the desire of a large nature to be free from everything like unfairness to the other side, he may unconsciously fall into unfairness to his own. "The provisional liturgy is not after the pattern, strictly, of any system of worship which has prevailed, hitherto, in any German Reformed Church, either in this country or in Europe. It makes no such profession or pretence. It aims to be an improvement upon this whole past cultus. All this it bears upon its face, without any sort of concealment or disguise." When Dr. Bomberger quotes, as he does, these concessions, he aids in fixing in his readers' mind a feeling of admiration for the direct, frank, and manly spirit of his opponent, and in making them feel that Dr. N.'s mistake is most likely to be that of a large nature which, in its desire to be free from everything like unfairness to the side he opposes may unconsciously fall into unfairness to his own.

IS THE REVISED LITURGY CONSISTENT WITH THE HISTORY OF
THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH?

That no man is opposed to history, unless he is persuaded that history is opposed to him, is as true as the renowned apothegm of Lord Bacon, which suggests it. Even a bulrush cannot grow up without mire, and it must have a root to draw life from the mire. Theories must be fragile indeed, which find nothing in the past to fix and feed them. Both Drs. Bomberger and Nevin feel this—both are anxious to have history with them, and to history both make their appeal. But they

* Liturgical Question, p. 39.

do not both appeal to the same history. Dr. N. urges the history of the Christian or Catholic Church; Dr. B. relies upon the history of the German Reformed Church. Dr. B. does not seem to find much to comfort him in the history of the Church at large, and Dr. N., in effect, gives up the liturgical antecedents of the German Reformed Church, and argues the question upon the broader and truer grounds of Christian liberty, wisely urging that times and circumstances change, and that we should change with them; that experience ripens, and we should ripen with it. Dr. Nevin is really pleading for the liberty of the Church, for her sacred right to change *pro re nata* whatever is human in her ordinances or modes, to add, abridge or alter, according to her needs in every age and in every land, whatever has been left free to her by the letter or Spirit of God's Word. Dr. B. on the contrary, in the name of freedom, argues with all his might for prescription, so far, at least, as it is on his side; for tradition, whenever tradition is with him. Curiously enough, while Dr. Nevin argues for some of the forms of the Ancient Church, which passed over from it into the Roman Church, he does it on the genuine principles of Protestant liberty, while Dr. Bomberger argues against the forms of Rome, on some of the principles on which Rome argues for them, and becomes one of the greatest sticklers for tradition.

"We contended," he says, "that the Liturgy should be in predominant harmony with the *traditional* usages of the German Reformed Church."* "The great aim was to work out the *traditional* spirit of the German Reformed Church,"† and he represents the bad work of his opponent as an attempt "to revolutionize her most *ancient ecclesiastical usages*."‡ So far then, as Dr. N. has in general, the hankering for "tradition," and "ancient usages," which is imputed to him, Dr. B. abundantly justifies him, as to the principle, and differs only as to what Church should furnish the traditions and usages—the one Dr. taking the ancient and modern Church Catholic as well as the German Reformed Church, surveying and drawing from the

* Revised Liturgy, p. 67. † *Id.*, 70. ‡ *Id.*, 70.

whole field of liturgics; the other narrowing himself very much to a small segment of the secondary form of Protestantism. Dr. Nevin's position is that of a large Protestant Catholicity. The position of Dr. B. is one which arrays him alike against the Church of the past, and the larger part of the Reformation—it has the narrowness of Puritan principle, without its consistency of application. He grants the value of tradition, yet insists that a part is greater than the whole, that the Palatinate is more than Christendom, and that one year in one century is worth more than the life of the Church through all ages. His whole conception of argument rests at last upon the supposition that the German Reformed Church is no part of the Church Catholic, but is an autochthene sect, finished in a solitary spasm, with nothing to draw from the past, and nothing to improve upon in the future.

The real question between Dr. B. and Dr. N., as loyal clergymen of the German Reformed Church, is not whether the fundamental principles and history of their Church *demand* such a liturgy as is now in dispute. Dr. N. admits that they do not. The real question is, whether they *allow* of such a liturgy. Dr. B. asserts that they do not. This is one of the points he urges with most vehemence, and it is just here that the ingenuousness of Dr. N's. nature seems to us relatively to weaken his argument. He concedes too much. He really in our judgment has much more foothold in the history of the Reformed Church, as the illustrator of his principles than he is disposed to claim. Both sides seem to us to have lost sight of one great source of evidence as to the worship of the Reformed Church. There is one essential difference between the German Agenda whether Lutheran or Reformed and the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer, which accounts for this oversight. It is this, that while in the Book of Common Prayer, everything is put down both for minister and people; in the German Agenda, Lutheran as well as Reformed, the Liturgy often has very little but what is meant for the minister, while the part assigned to the people is to be looked for in their hymn books. If the old German Reformed Hymn Books be examined, we think that

they will present some facts which will greatly strengthen the historical aspects of the argument for the Revised Liturgy as a genuine German Reformed book of worship.

We are not going to any of the learned sources for an illustration of this. These have been examined on both sides, very thoroughly, and as we think we shall show, too exclusively. We have in our hands a moderately old German Reformed Hymn Book, one of the many actually used in the Valley of Virginia, in worship, in 1792. This book both before and after that date, was in very wide, in fact, in nearly or quite universal use in the German Reformed Church in this country. We have met with it everywhere, and it was reprinted by Sauer,* without change. It is the Marburg and Frankfort Collection of Psalms and Hymns, (1778,) "as they have hitherto been used in the Reformed Churches of Hesse, Hanau, the Palatinate† and many other neighboring lands, with the Heidelberg Catechism," and a full liturgy.

1. And, first of all, the very existence of this book, of SEVEN HUNDRED HYMNS, most of them drawn from the Ancient Church and the Lutheran Hymn writers, this book in nearly universal use in the German Reformed Church in Europe, the book of the German Reformed Church established in America, is death to the fossil theory of Dr. Bomberger, in regard to the immutable "tradition" of his Church. For the original usage and tradition of the Palatinate Church was, that nothing but the *Psalms* and the poetical parts of *Scripture* should be sung in public worship. The Palatinate Church Order says expressly: "Touching the singing of the *Psalms*, the apostle Paul exhorts, &c., &c., wherefore it is our will that none other than the German *Psalms* be sung in our churches." "German *Psalms* shall be sung both before and after the sermon:" "if the people be able to sing, a penitential *Psalm* shall be sung." "Before the sermon, a German *Psalm* shall be sung." The first "*tradition*" of the Reformed Church, as

* A copy of Sauer's first edition is in the library of Rev. P. S. Davis, of Chambersburg.

† Sauer's title-page adds: "Pennsylvania."

Dr. Bomberger defines tradition, was *not to sing at all* in public worship; in Zuingle's Service, everything was said—nothing sung. The second tradition was to sing nothing but *Psalms*, or close paraphrases of Scripture poetry; and this is the true original Palatinate tradition. The third tradition as the whole German Reformed Church of Europe, and her daughter, the infant and mature Reformed Church in America held it, is that *hymns* from uninspired hands may be sung in the worship of God. Nothing in the "order of service," as radically departs from the first and second Reformed tradition, as does this. Yet the traditionary party in the Reformed Church sing from a collection of more than five hundred uninspired hymns—and Dr. Bomberger has issued a collection of between three and four hundred hymns of the same kind for Sunday Schools.* The revisions of the Palatinate Liturgy itself testify against the principle of fossilism. For example, the revised Palatinate Liturgy of 1684, which Dr. Bomberger translated, and published in the *Mercersburg Review* (January, 1850), says: "German Psalms or *Hymns* shall be sung before or after the sermon;" but in the original the Palatinate order of 1563, and all the earlier editions it is exclusively "German Psalms."† Here was a surrender, out and out, of a liturgical practice and principle, in which the German Reformed Church coincides at first with all the Calvinistic Churches. The French Calvinistic books, which were the great continental model, originally and for a long time embraced nothing but Marot's and Beza's Psalms, with the Ten Commandments, and song of Simeon, also in rhyme, though they ultimately also took in hymns in large numbers.

2. This book has the Psalms rendered very closely, not with interpolations, changes of meaning and subjective adaptations, like those of Dr. Watts, but rigorously as to the sense. It is the version of Lobwasser, the Rous of the German Church. He was a Lutheran, but the rigid literalness of his renderings prevented their use in the Lutheran Church. The desire of

* *Prayers and Hymns for Sunday Schools*. Phila.: 1867. 18mo. pp. 286.

† Richter. K. O. II. 257.

the Reformed Church evidently was to have the Psalms as nearly like the original as was consistent with their being sung by the people. Now, when the Revised Liturgy sets forth Psalms unrhymed to be sung, does it not conform more closely to the German Reformed model, than do those who sing mere adaptations like the current ones, which are used freely by its opponents? To sing medications like those of Watts' and his school, as the very Psalms of David, would have been an abomination to the original Reformed Churches. Yet the Books both in English and German, used unchallenged by the whole German Reformed Church in this country, set forth this very class of Psalm renderings. Here, at least, the Revised Liturgy approximates more nearly than its opponents, to the old view and usage of the Reformed Churches.

We speak advisedly when we say, that to the whole original Reformed Church, and especially to the Palatinate fathers, a large proportion of what is sung as "Psalms" in the English congregations of the German Reformed Church, would have been intolerable, on the ground that pretending to be the Psalms of David they were really the Psalms of Dr. Watts, and of the other authors of the Sacred Parodies. When the German Reformed Church came to use such imitations of the Psalms, she never put them among the Psalms, but where they belong, among Hymns—human effusions suggested by divine originals. The other course is a complete confounding of the unequivocally apocryphal with the canonical, and the effect has been very mischievous. Dr. Watts' Psalms have virtually had the authority of inspiration with those who sing them.

8. There is a table, by which every one of these Psalms is adapted to a day of the Church year; in other words, we have in effect a system of Psalm INTROITS for the entire year, not simply for the chief festivals: and not only are the names of the Sundays derived from the ancient INTROITS—such as Jubilate and Cantate retained, but the Psalms from which the titles are taken are assigned for those days, in all which the spirit of the Revised Liturgy is sustained over against its opponents.

4. The first hymn for opening worship in the *Veni Sancte Spiritus* reple (*Komm Heiliger Geist*). It is unrhymed, a chant, to be sung by the people, one of the ancient hymns in use in the Romish Church, and sung in the opening of the Mass in some of the old "Liturgies."*

5. The *adjutorium*: "Our help is in the name of the Lord," taken from the Romish Mass, is used at the beginning of various services.

6. In the Exhortation to Confession before Communion, the minister says: "Wherefore *say* with me: I, a poor sinner," &c.

7. The "Kyrie Eleison" is used. Hymn 209 is the Ten Commandments, at the end of each one of which the people sung untranslated the Kyrie Eleison. They sung it in the same way, without change, both at the beginning and end of the Litany (H. 481).

8. The form of Absolution is of the strongest kind, not one whit surpassed by phrases in the Revised Liturgy, to which most exception has been made.

9. The people are charged to say Amen, in token of their desire to have an interest in the work of Christ: "Wherefore let each one who desires this from his heart, *say* Amen." (*Sprech ein jede, Amen*).

10. The GLORIA IN EXCELSIS (*Allein Gott in der hoh sey Ehr*) is given, one of those glorious hymns, which passed from the Greek Church into the Romish, at that period of which the opponents of the Revised Liturgy seem to think so poorly.

11. A table of EVERY DAY of the CHURCH YEAR is given (fifty-five days in all), with the proper Psalms for each indicated. In the first edition of the Palatinate order, only the chief festivals were specified, but as early at least as the edition of 1585, the use of the Gospels for the Sundays of the whole year was authorized.†

* See Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, according to the use of Sarum, Bangor, York, &c. By Rev. W. Maskell, M. A. 2d Edit. London: Pickering. 1846. In some of these Liturgies the *Veni Sancte Creator Spiritus* was sung. A translation of the *Veni Sancte Spiritus, Reple*, is given in the "Jubilee Service." Hymn I.

† Daniel; Codex Liturgic. III. 66, n. 2.

12. The old arrangement of the GRADUAL PSALM, after the Epistle, is made easy by having all the Psalms set to music.

13. The HALLELUIA is provided for a number of the Hymns.

14. The old VERSICLE, "Da Pacem" (verleih uns Frieden), for the *Collect* for Peace is given, and then follows the *Collect* for Peace, in *prose*, to be chanted by the people, after the service.

15. For the close of the service is provided a translation of the sequence of Gregory the Great: "Grates nunc omnes." It is in *prose*, and to be chanted.

The Hymns follow the order of the CHIEF FESTIVALS, and afterwards of Subjects.

16. The Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds are all given in the *Agenda*, and the putting of them *there* implies that they are to be used in worship.

17. The NICENE CREED, in its metrical form: "Wir glauben all an Einen Gott," is given to be sung by the people.

18. The APOSTLES' CREED is provided for the oral use of the people.

a. In the Baptismal Service, the minister, before the Creed, says: "*Confess also with me.*" Now there may be silent faith, but *joint confession* must be audible. "With the mouth confession is made."

b. Before the Lord's Supper, the minister, before the Apostles' Creed, says: "Which we confess with *mouth* and heart, saying."

c. In the Hymn-Book, the APOSTLES' CREED (220), *not in metre, but in prose*, is provided for the people—to be sung by them. It is worthy of note, that while in the *Agenda*, the text of the article on the Church runs: "Eine heilige allgemeine Christliche Kirche," in the Hymn-Book Luther's rendering is retained without change: "Eine heilige Christliche Kirche."

19. But, perhaps, most interesting of all as cutting up by the roots one of Dr. B's. most persistent assumptions, is the LITANY. As to the mode of the service, Dr. B. is most of all

set against its *responsive* character. "A responsive order of service," "forms extremely responsive," "Extremely responsive order," "multiplied responses,"* "excess of responses," excite his most earnest antipathy, and he pleads for "non-responsive forms,"† "reducing the number of responses." But here, in the heart of this book, brought by German Reformed Christians to this new world to be used in the worship of God, we have a prayer which may be said to be all responses, the most responsive of prayers. It is arranged after Luther, so that the minister, choir, or part of the people make fifty-nine invocations or prayers, and the congregations at large make *forty-four responses*. There was nothing to prevent a German Reformed minister from having, at every service, this Prayer with forty-four, or for the matter of that, as antiphonal parts, *one hundred and three responses*. Compared with these, what are the "eighteen responses," of the morning service, the seventeen of the evening service, at which Dr. B. murmurs? And then these prayers were sung, and that singing was chanting, and even the Greek words, which attest that it comes from the "Ancient Church," were retained. If our German Reformed friends will only sing the responses, instead of saying them, they will have their own history as well as the General history of the Church with them.

18. The German *SANCTUS* is also given. (172).

19. Dr. B. is willing that the "congregation should be *allowed* to unite aloud in the Lord's Prayer." In this old book, the minister calls on them to do it as a duty: "Let us invoke, and say thus: Our Father."

20. The German *AGNUS DEI* is also given, (O Lamm Gottes unschuldig) another hymn of the ancient church, and is in prose as part of the litany.

21. This mute old witness of the Lutheranizing conservatism of the German Reformed Church in Liturgics over against the Puritan extreme of Ultra Protestantism, gives us (we are afraid

* Revised Liturgy, pp. 21, 42, 59, 60, 65, 78, 75.

† Do., pp. 68, 71.

we are going to shock our friend, Dr. B. greatly now,) the *MAGNIFICAT*, the song of the blessed Virgin, which even the Protestant Episcopal Church has marred its service, by omitting, probably out of deference to the Anti-Romish feeling. But this is not the worst. It gives three different renderings of it—the second one closing with the *GLORIA PATRI*.

22. But the old book is not done yet with the ancient church and its responsive tendencies. It gives us the "*Te Deum Laudamus*," and this in the German arrangement, is divided into two great responsive portions—twenty-five for each part of the congregation separately, and two parts for them conjointly, fifty-two responses in all. Now if in those primeval days of German Reformed irresponsible apostolic simplicity, for whose return Dr. B. sighs, the minister had used the *Te Deum*, as well as the Litany, there would have been one hundred and fifty-five responses in these two parts of the service alone, and certainly our Reformed friends may, without disturbing the ashes of their fathers, or doing dishonor to their memory, have a good liturgy, and respond in it to their heart's content.

What a testimony then have we here, in this old hymn book of the fathers—that the German Reformed Church used her Christian Liberty, that she ripened in worship, that she did not fetter herself by the mechanical traditions of a single period in her history—that she availed herself more and more of the treasures of devotion in the Church Catholic, in the Western Church, and in the Lutheran Church—that she gave her people an increasing, direct share in the public worship of God. Certainly the "*Order of Worship*" is in the full line of development as revealed in the Hymn Book and Agenda of the Reformed Church which was planted in this country—and Dr. Bomberger's views have no support in the traditionary life of the Reformed Church, considered as a whole. There is a parenthesis of three centuries between his views, and the point of union they propose to make, and if these three centuries could be ignored, the radical traditionary party would after all be found more fatally at issue with the Palatinate usage and principle, than the conservative progressive party.

Let us to have clearly before us what was *possible* in the service of the early German Reformed Church, in this country, and in common with its mother in Europe, suppose a pastor imbued with the knowledge and spirit of public worship, with this old book in his hand, and the worship might, without the violation of any rubric, have proceeded thus:

1. The congregation gathers, and seated with bowed head engages in silent prayer. The silence is broken by the people chanting the "Veni Sancti Spiritus, Reple. (H. 2,) closing with the Alleluia.

2. The Minister uses the *Adjutorium*—Confession of sins is made and followed by the ABSOLUTION.

3. The INTROIT AL PSALM for the day is sung, closing with the GLORIA PATRI.

4. Then follows the EPISTLE for the day.

5. After which is sung the GLORIA IN EXCELSIS (H. 25): or the TE DEUM (responsively): (at night the MAGNIFICAT, H. 72, 73, 74.)

6. THE GOSPEL for the day.

7. The NICENE CREED; metrical: (H. 219) or the Apostles' Creed, in prose, (H. 220) sung by the people.

8. The Sermon.

9. The Hymn-Psalm "Create in me a clean heart." (Ps. 51), sung by the people. Or "Grates nunc omnes" (H. 9), chanted.

10. The Litany (responsive) as a General Prayer, with the Lord's Prayer said by all.

11. The Doxology.

12. The Versicle and COLLECT for Peace, sung by the people.

13. The Benediction.

If there were a Communion, there might be used at the proper place; the SANCTUS (H. 172), and AGNUS DEI (H. 106). The NUNC DIMITTIS, metrical (H. 68,) might be sung in closing.

The chant—the response—the audible union in prayer, the singing of the Creed, the living participation of the people throughout, certainly are not only possible, but are invited by

the book of Worship, bearing which in their hands, the Pilgrim fathers of the Reformed Church came to this land.

To a number of these facts, when they were presented a few years ago by the writer, an effort at reply was made. The reply may be analyzed thus: It consisted:

1. Of a repetition of the facts urged. We made an assertion in our own words. The reviewer met it by making the same assertion in his own words. We said that the *Te Deum* and Litany were placed in the German Reformed Hymn Book to be sung by the people—and the answer was, It is so. BUT “they are named as hymns, and indicated to be sung as hymns.” Be it so. The *Te Deum* is a hymn, and ought to be indicated to be sung. Name the Litany as you please—only sing it. And so name if you will the old Collect for peace (13), and the Apostles’ Creed in prose, (220) hymns, and sing them. Only agree on things and we shall soon cease, to quarrel about names. The point we make is that being in the people’s hymn book they were meant for the people. The reply simply rivets what we drove in.

2. The second feature of the reply is that the reviewer with one book, attempts to follow if not correct us, in our notice of another and different one. His hymn-book is not the one we quote—but with a different date, different title, different contents, and a different number of hymns. It is apparently an earlier and inferior issue to the one which came into nearly universal use in the German Reformed Churches in this country. The reviewer’s book nevertheless sustains our facts—and has nearly as fully as the later and best edition, everything which could be referred to “influences probably of a Lutheran origin.” “It is,” says the Reviewer, “evidently substantially the same.” But the very existence of later revised and improved editions, is a witness against the fossilism of a narrow Liturgical tradition.

3. A good deal of the reply rests upon the assumption that we assert that the service in the old Hymn Book is completely identical in arrangement and elements with that of the Order of Worship. Our argument simply is that it justifies the principle, and to a large extent some of the very details of the “Order of Worship.”

The Hymn Book has old forms, which the Order of Worship has not. The Order has forms which the Hymn Book has not. But both have the most important ones in common—and both rest on the same principle, even where they differ in its application to this or that detail.

4. It is urged that when the Agenda uses the word "*say*" it means "*think*:" when it directs that a form shall be used "*with heart and mouth*," it means, "*with the heart only*," when the minister charges the people "*speak therefore thus with me*" it means that he is to *say* it and they are to *think* it. But why not apply the canon to the whole rubric when it directs the minister to "*say*" things? Why not urge that he too can "*say*," in in silence—and the Palatinate Liturgy could be used as a directory for the silent worship of the Quakers? To argue back from the usage which Rationalism has brought into the Church to the meaning of terms at a period when men said just what they meant, simply and straight out, is certainly illogical in any case, but peculiarly so in the case of the Palatinate Liturgy, which so carefully distinguishes between what is to be said merely "*in the heart*"—and what is to be said "*with the heart and mouth*."

What was the probable Reformed usage as to audible Confession of Sin is shown in the modifications of the Genevan Liturgy, as contained in the Frankfort Order of 1554, which was one of the chief sources of the German Reformed Order of 1563. Thus it says: "Brethren let each one of you confess his sins, and among you, I saying them before you, follow me in these words."* In the Genevan Liturgy itself the Confession was silent (*mente-de son cœur*), and without an Absolution—but on German ground the Confession becomes audible, the Absolution is spoken. In the Genevan the Confession was before the Sermon, in the Reformed Church it followed the Sermon.

Now, these and some other peculiarities indicate the operation of influences, which ought never to be left out of sight, in the interpretation of the doctrinal formulas and the

* "*Frates vestrum unusquisque peccata sua confiteatur, atque apud vostmetipsos me praeuentem sequimini his verbis.*" In Richter, II. 150.

liturgical literature of the German Reformed Church. The Palatinate Order was introduced among a population who had been Lutheran, with the liturgical forms of that Church familiar and dear to them. These forms were largely retained. We have before us the Palatinate Lutheran Liturgy,* which was superseded by the Reformed. The Reformed Confession is taken from the Lutheran. The Lutheran Rubric directs the minister to say to the people: "Speak thus." (*Sprechet also*). The Reformed is more explicit: "Speak, therefore, with me thus." Now the Lutheran mode was, and in many Churches still is, for the minister to repeat the words—and the people repeated *after* him. The people of the Palatinate could have understood the words in but one way—and beyond all reasonable doubt *spoke* the familiar Confession in the old way, and at the old place (after the Sermon). We lay it down as a fair principle of grammatico-historical interpretation, that the Palatinate Liturgy, in all disputed cases, is to be interpreted in a Lutheranizing sense—that is, its phrases for the people are to be interpreted, as they must have been interpreted by a population which had been reared in the Lutheran Church, and who had heard, all their lives, these identical phrases in one sense only. The Reviewer, forgetting the fossil theory to which he is committed, directs attention to the fact that while the Palatinate Liturgy has the "Confession and Absolution as a regular and invariable part of the Sunday Service, the late rubric and practice confined it to the Communion Service"—and then with apparently no consciousness of the egregious blunder in his argument involved in this statement, charges it as a defect in the Revised Liturgy, that it conforms, in this point, with the original Palatinate Liturgy. So much for "Tradition," when tradition is against the Reviewer's party, and in favor of the views that he condemns.

5. The Reviewer assumes that he knows certain things, which he states, and of which he imagines the writer to be ignorant—but all which the Reviewer really knows among the

* Kirchenordnung wie es mit der Christlichen Lehre, &c. (The General title is identical with the Reformed order). 1556. (Neuburg: Killian).

things stated, the writer also knows, and has said nothing in conflict with them. There *are* things *stated* by the Reviewer which the writer does not know—nor the Reviewer either. The Reviewer seems to claim a superior knowledge of the source of the Agenda in the Hymn-Book. Yet after identifying it with that of the Palatinate, he seems to have looked further, and to have felt forced to acknowledge, that “*while the Liturgy is the Palatinate, yet some few changes ought perhaps to be noted, not however affecting the present discussion;*” that is as Charles Lamb would put it: they are the same—with a difference. The changes, as he notes them, are: First, That the Palatinate *adds* liturgical matter, which the Hymn-Book *omits*.

Second. The Hymn-Book *adds* matter which the Palatinate *omits*.

Third. That the Hymn-book *alters*, in various ways, the matter it retains.

The Reviewer is right in this acknowledgment of changes, and deserves credit for correcting himself; but if he had a faithful reprint of the first Palatinate before him, he would see how much wider than he suspects is the departure silently and constantly made in the Reformed Church, from the authority of the Palatinate Liturgy. In all these deviations of the Hymn-Book, the Reviewer seems to see improvements, that is, he justifies *omissions, additions and changes* in the Liturgy despite the old Palatinate—he gives up the whole fossil theory in the very act of attempting its defence.

The fact is, Dr. B. and his party, are in their practice utterly quenched by their own theory. Dr. Nevin and the conservative part of his Church with him, have the history of the development of the Reformed Church with them in the *principle* on which rests the right of the Church to set forth a new Liturgy, even if that history does not furnish its details. On the other hand the *history* of the Reformed Church is *against* the fossil *principle*, and either neutral to the *details* of its practice, or opposed to them. That is, the history of the Reformed Church sustains the conservative *principle* over against the fossil, and

though it can be fully claimed for the details of neither, is less in favor of those who have appealed to it, than of those they condemn. The Palatinate fathers of 1563 would find their precise forms in neither part of the German Reformed Church, but they would find the *principle* on which they made changes then, the principle on which a progressive conservatism claims the right to make them now.

When we see all the various parts of the German Reformed Church, abridging, enlarging, and changing their liturgies—when we see that there were local differences, which never marred their unity of faith, when we think of the common foundation of our Protestant liberty, it seems wonderful, that any Protestant should be found who attempts to raise up a prescription, in its essential character more narrow, more Romish, than that of Rome. The true principle of the Reformed Church, in common with all genuine Protestantism, is that expressed by Ursinus: * “The ceremonies, which are ordained by the Church, may be changed by the Church, if there be good cause.” If Progressive Conservatives can show that the “good cause” is with them, they can fairly claim that the history of the Church is not against them.

WORSHIP AND USAGES IN THE REFORMED CHURCHES OF THE CONTINENT.

The Church of England, and her American daughter, the Protestant Episcopal Church, are claimed or repudiated as parts of the Calvinistic or Reformed Churches, just as whim or interest suggests. In the great contests of the Church of England with her Puritan opponents, they constantly urged against her that her worship was Romanizing, or Lutheranizing, and wholly different from the worship of the Continental Reformed Church. This charge was taken up and handled with

* On the Catechism. Quest. 103.

special fullness and ability by John Durel (minister, at the time his book was written, of the French Church in the Savoy).^{*} The opportunities which Durel had of knowing the usages of the Reformed Churches on the Continent were very great,[†] and his statements may, in all essential respects, be received with unqualified confidence. In addition to Durel, we shall use, in this part of our article, the works of Ebrard,[‡] Daniel,[§] Alt,^{||} Richter,[¶] Bingham,^{**} and others, which will be cited at their place.

When we come to the historical traces of the usages of the German Reformed and other Reformed Churches of the Continent, from the Reformation up to the middle of the Seventeenth Century, we find very much to which the Revised Liturgy could appeal in vindication of its claim to toleration and fair trial, which are all it asks.

In the Reformed Church of France, on entering the Church they knelt and offered a silent prayer before taking their seats. In Poland and Lithuania they stood during singing and the reading of the Scriptures. *Kneeling* was the usual posture at prayer. The English Puritans made a point of keeping their hats on during the whole service. The Reformed on the Continent for the most part kept their *heads uncovered*. Even at Geneva, where the hat was worn during the sermon, it was removed in the service. In the discipline of the Reformed Churches of France,^{††} it is enjoined that "every one, without

^{*} A view of the Government and Public Worship of God in the Reformed Churches beyond the seas. Wherein is showed their conformity and agreement with the Church of England, as it is established by the act of Uniformity. London, 1662. 4to. pp. xx. 344.—Liturgy of the Church of England asserted. London, 1662. 4to. pp. 38.

[†] See Sketches of his life, and his "View," p. 4.

[‡] Reformiertes Kirchenbuch. Zürich, 1847. 4to. pp. 290.

[§] Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiarum Reformatarum, &c. Lipsiæ, 1851. 8vo. pp. 627.

^{||} Kirchliche Gottesdienst (1851). Kirchenjahr (1860). Sunday Service according to the Liturgies of the Churches of the Reformation, on the basis of Alt, by C. P. Krauth. 1853. 8vo. pp. 48.

[¶] Kirchenordnungen des Sechzehnten Jahrhunderts. Weimar, 1846. 2 vols. 4to.

^{**} Apologia Eccles. Gallicanæ pro Eccles. Anglicana.

^{††} Chap. 10, Art. 1, quoted in Durel, pp. 33, 34.

exception, do by these outward signs (uncovering the head and bending the knee), testify the humility of their hearts, and of that inward homage which they yield unto God." In Lithuania, Poland, and Bremen, the hats, during sermon, were lifted at the name of *Jesus*, and the women bowed or courtesied; and this usage largely, though not universally, prevailed in the Palatinate. In the French Reformed Church, after singing the Ten Commandments, they *fell upon their knees* and sung the Kyrie (rhymed). The Nunc Dimittis was also sung, *kneeling*, after Communion.

In Hesse, the *Psalms* were sung *antiphonally*: the Præcentor and choristers, with all the people, sung one verse; then, with the accompaniment of the organ, the second was sung very softly by a few voices; the third was then sung as the second, the fourth as the third, and so to the end. In the Church at Bremen, the *Psalms* were sung by course, in a very elaborate manner.

Though Calvin's Liturgy opens with a form of Confession, which was to be said kneeling, yet the fear of giving offence caused him, against his own judgment and wish, to omit a form of *Absolution* at Geneva; but he says: "We are most earnest in desiring that the people have the *Absolution* pronounced unto them, and to hear it upon their *knees*."* But, more than this, Calvin approved of *Private Absolution*. "I do not propose to deny how useful Private Absolution is; but, as I have done in many of my writings, *I recommend* the use of it, provided it be free, and pure from superstition." (Second Defence against Westphal. VIII., 678). Many of the Reformed Churches of France, Hesse, and elsewhere, had forms of General Absolution. The Bohemian Confession†

* Epistolæ, Genev. Edit. p. 452. Amsterdam Edit. (1667). Ep. de Rit. p. 206.

† Corpus Libr. Symb. qui in Eccles. Reformatorum auctor. publ. obt. (Augusti), 1827. pp. 275—326.

Collectio Confess. in Eccl. Reformat, publ. Edit. H. A. Niemeyer. Lipsiæ. 1840. pp. 771—852.

Samml. Symbol. Bücher welche in der Ev. Reformirten Kirche, &c. (F. A. Beck). 2d Ed. Neustadt, 1845. Vol. ii. 1—167.

says: "They teach that penitents should approach the Priest (sacerdotem), and before him confess to God Himself their sins (though we do not command or exact the enumeration of the particular sins), and should seek from him (the Priest) counsel and instruction how to avoid sin, and should seek from him absolution through the keys of the Church, that they may obtain the remission of sins by the ministry thus instituted by Christ. Men are likewise taught, that they should highly esteem the Absolution, and should believe, that what is promised through the keys, beyond doubt takes place, inasmuch as it is the voice of Christ, set forth in His command: John xx. 23. 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them,' &c., and they should know that by the use and ministry of the keys, and by authority of Christ's words, all their sins are forgiven them." (Art. V). In the Reformed Church of Poland, the Declaration of Thorn, in rejecting Auricular Confession, and all the associated errors of the Church of Rome, thus beautifully describes and recommends Private Absolution: "We hold it to be free, and most useful for anxious consciences, to resort to the counsel of those who by their office come to a more familiar acquaintance with the nature and circumstances of sins, to seek consolation each from his own pastor, by some declaration of the sins by which the anxious mind is tortured; and for this reason also we believe *that it is useful to retain Private Absolution.*" (Augusti Ed. p. 434. Niemeyer's, 683. Beck, II. 162).

The original Reformed Churches were all Liturgical Churches; all had, and used forms of service. This is true even of the least conservative of them, as for example the Church of Scotland. Ultra Puritanism is no part of the Reformation, or of the original Reformed Churches, but a schism from the Reformed Church. Lewis Capellus, a great teacher in the Dutch Reformed Church, calls the Puritans "morose, scrupulous, and too finical, not to say superstitious men, to whom it has seemed good for very trifling reasons, almost of no moment whatever, to abrogate the Liturgy hitherto used in the Church of

England, and to substitute for it what they call their 'Directory.' While the Liturgies of the Reformed Churches made an opening for free prayer (usually as a preparation for the sermon) to a limited extent, they fixed the main parts of the service; and it was not left to the discretion of ministers or congregations to depart from these. Calvin* says: "I approve very much that the form of prayers and rites of the Church be fixed, from which it would not be lawful for the pastors to depart in their function." The Kirk of Scotland, at the beginning of the Reformation, used the Book of Common Prayer.

The Reformed Church of Hesse had the service at the Communion-table, to which they did not hesitate to give the name Altar. The Genevan and many other Reformed services begin with the adjutorium: "Our help is in the name of the Lord."

For a day of humiliation Calvin set forth a form to be used by himself and the other ministers. Calvin, in his Liturgy, enjoins the *bidding prayer*, and himself used it. In the Church of Geneva certain proper Psalms were appointed, not only for *Sundays*, but for particular *hours* of the day.

The Reformed ministers wore the cassock, gown, and surcingle. The pictures of Calvin, and the Reformers of his school, represent them in the gown and cap characteristic of divines. The Reformed ministers of Poland and Lithuania, when they ministered in Lutheran Churches, wore the white surplice. Peter Martyr says: "If there were peace between our Churches and the Saxon (Lutheran) Churches as touching doctrine, there would be no separation whatever about vestments of this kind (the surplice)."[†]

The Reformed Churches kept the holy days of the Church-Year. The Synod of Dort enjoined the keeping of Christmas, Easter, Whitsunday, and recommended that the Churches which did not keep Circumcision and Ascension should conform to the "use of the other Churches" by observing them. Some

* Ep. ad Protect. Angli.

† C. 24.

of the Reformed Churches observed the days of the blessed Virgin, of the Apostles and Martyrs, and of Saints.*

The Helvetic Confession says: "It is not lawful for any one

* The Declaration of Thorn, alluding to the festivals commemorative of our Lord, adds: "We keep as festivals (*feriatis agimus*) certain days dedicated to the memory of the saints, as, for example, the days of the blessed (*beatæ*) Virgin Mary, Michael the Archangel, and of the Apostles, to show forth in grateful commemoration in the grace of God imparted to them or through them, and to arouse ourselves to the imitation of their example." (Augusti: 425. Beck, II. 151. Niemeyer: 678). The original views of the Continental Churches in regard to the "Sabbath," and "Lord's Day," were completely in conflict with the Puritan theory, even more so than those of the Lutheran Church. Thus the second Helvetic Confession (1566) says: "The Lord's Day itself was, in the ancient Church, from the Apostles' times, consecrated to sacred rest, which also now rightly is kept by our Churches for worship and love's sake. But we concede nothing herein to Jewish observations and superstitions. For we do not believe one day to be holier than another, nor that rest is, *per se*, pleasing to God, but we observe the Lord's Day, not the Sabbath, with a free observation." (Augusti: 82. Beck, I. 169. Niemeyer, 526). The Genevan Catechism (1541), prepared by Calvin, which divides the palm of rude reception in the Reformed Church with the Heidelberg, says, in explaining the Commandment in regard to the Sabbath: "The observation of rest is part of the old ceremonies, and is therefore abrogated by the coming of Christ. This commandment, so far as it is ceremonial, pertains properly to the Jews only, and is consequently temporary." (Augusti, 493. Beck, I. 249. Niemeyer, 145). The Heidelberg Catechism (Quest. 163) makes the Sabbath law cover "other times, and especially the holy-days" of the Church-Year (*besonders am Feiertage festis diebus*), does not mention the Lord's Day at all, and is thoroughly anti-Puritan in the whole interpretation of the command. Ursinus, in his interpretation of the command, is thoroughly at war with the Puritan theory of the Sabbath. He makes the whole moral and perpetual part of the commandment to be that "*some certain time* be allotted to the ministry of the Church, or to the public service of God," "to allot some time to sermons, prayers, and the administration of the sacraments." "The other part is ceremonial, and temporary, namely, that that time be the seventh day." "The Sabbath of the seventh day was, together with the rest of the ceremonies and types, fulfilled and abrogated by the coming of the Messiah." "The new Sabbath dependeth on the arbitrament or appointment of the Church, which for certain causes maketh choice of the first day, and that first day is to be observed for order's sake, but without any opinion of necessity, as if that and no other were to be observed by the Church." "We are not restrained or tied to have either Saturday or Wednesday, or any other certain day." If the Reformed fathers, with Calvin at their head, could have appeared in the noontide time of Puritanism in New England, with their views of the Sabbath, and their consonant practices, they would have fared little better than the Salem witches; and if they were to appear in some of the Reformed Churches, to whose soul the flattering unction is laid, that they by pre-eminence cleave to the Palatinate principles, and the Heidelberg Catechism, in their original purity, these fathers would fare no better than the Revised Order of worship.

to overthrow this ordinance of the Church in regard to the regulation of public prayer." "We do approve exceedingly of the religious celebration of Christmas, Circumcision, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension, and Whitsunday. This Helvetic Confession was subscribed largely by the Reformed Churches, among them by the Church of Geneva, and, in 1566, by that of Scotland. Fasting days, set days, Fridays, Ember-weeks, Lent, and the Passion-week were observed in Poland, Bohemia, and Lithuania.

In Holland, Germany, Switzerland, Geneva, and elsewhere, the old churches were kept, the images and movable pictures being taken down; but even in Geneva the pictures on the windows of stained glass were not removed. In many cases the crosses on the churches were spared, and on the new-built Reformed Churches, as for instance in Caen, crosses were set up. In some of the Genevan Psalters and Bibles, Faith is represented leaning on the cross. In the French Church (1609), express action was taken, authorizing maimed Reformed soldiers to wear the *cross* upon their cloaks, which was required for the reception of the king's aid. Forms for the dedication of Churches were used. The chancels were left unchanged in most of the Churches, and the fonts of stone retained. Whether a single or trine application should be made of the water in Baptism, was left free. Both were in use in the German Reformed Church.* Zuingli approved and retained the *Chrism-cloth* in Baptism (*Westerhemde*). The *rite of Confirmation*, by the laying on of hands, was at first rejected in all the Reformed Churches, and no one of them speaks of it more bitterly than the Palatinate Liturgy. It appoints simply that the children shall be instructed in the Catechism, and that before they are admitted to the Lord's table, they shall be examined in the Catechism before the whole Congregation—and then contrasts with this the work of "Satan through the anti-

* Daniel. Cod. Lit. iii. 127. N. 2.

christ, to wit, the Pope, substituting his smearing and slapping, and other abominations, which he calls Confirmation."* Nevertheless, the rite of Confirmation has been introduced into the German Reformed, the Dutch, and other parts of the Reformed Church—and is not, we believe, objected to even by the sticklers for the Palatinate Liturgy as it was, which knew of no such rite.

At the Cathedral Church of Basle, the stone altar, on which Mass was once said, was retained. In the Cathedral of Berne, and in that of Lausanne, they had altars of black marble, and in the country Churches of that Canton, the common material of the altar was a dark blue stone, and these Churches called their Communion-tables *altars*. Violent as was the opposition on the part of many of the early Zuinglian and Calvinistic Reformers to the very name of altar, as applied to the Communion-table, the name became more and more common among the conservative part of the Reformed Communion, and especially in the German Reformed Church. In the great Churches silver chalices and plates were used at the Communion. The Ten Commandments, Creed, and Lord's Prayer, were sometimes set in large tablets. Originally the opposition to statuary and paintings in the Churches was very strong. "It is contrary to Scripture, that the image of a man should be placed in the Church of Christ." (Helv. Conf. ch. iv). The Heidelberg Catechism teaches that the Second Commandment forbids "the expressing God by any image or figure," and that "paintings and sculpture are not to be tolerated in the Churches." The principles of the Catechism would not allow of even the engravings of the ordinary pictorial Bibles, or other books in which God is pictured. Even any kind of sculpture or painting of sacred objects in the Church is, to use the words of Ursinus, "not to be tolerated, but utterly to be abolished, and removed from the sight of man whether they be worshipped or no." The 98th Question, and Ursinus' argument upon it,

* In Richter. II. 260.

is directed distinctively against the Lutheran view. But this early rigorism has yielded everywhere, not only in the conservative part of the Reformed Church, but in Puritanism itself. Even in arguing against images, The Tetrapolitan (oh. xxi.) says: "We also confess that the use of paintings and statuary is of itself free." Calvin, in the Geneva Catechism, is very moderate. "This commandment does not prohibit painting or statuary, but only the making of pictures or images to represent God, or to be worshiped. Wherefore we are not to understand that pictures or sculpture are condemned in these words, but only that we are prohibited from making images, in order that we may seek or worship God in them; or, what is the same thing, that we should worship them to the honor of God, or in any way abuse them to superstition or idolatry." (Augusti, 489. Beck, I. 243. Niemeyer, 141).

In entering the Reformed Churches on the Continent, the men took off their hats, the women of quality their masks, the devout knelt and offered silent prayer before taking their seats. The Puritan "Directory" *forbids the offering of silent prayer on entering the Church*. In the Reformed Churches the head was uncovered during the worship. In Lithuania, Polonia, in Bremen, and by many in the Palatinate, the hats were taken off at the name of Jesus, and the women, if sitting, bowed their heads, if standing, made a courtesy.

In Transylvania and Hungary there was daily morning and evening Common Prayer, with preaching in addition on Wednesdays and Fridays. In Hesse, and in many French Churches, there was daily prayer at noon. Many of the Reformed Liturgies have an order of Morning and Evening Prayer, Forms of Confession of Sins, General Prayer, the Litany, forms for Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the Church Rites. The service generally begins with a Confession of Sin, which opens with the Adjutorium retained from the Romish service. The *Absolution* follows in most. Calvin, as we have seen, laments that he had "yielded too early" against his better

judgment, in omitting a form of Absolution to avoid giving certain persons offence."*

The Reformed Churches, to a large extent, had appointed services, in some cases, for the Church-year, in others for every day. In some, as in Hesse, the minister took his text out of the Gospel. In Lithuania and Poland the three General Creeds were rehearsed in their fit place. The Lord's Prayer was much used. In Calvin's Liturgy, it could be used before the service; a paraphrase of it closes his general prayer; and it occurs in most of the offices. In the French Church in Holland it occurred three times in one service. It was said aloud at meals after grace. Most of the Puritans omitted it from public worship. In Poland and Lithuania the people stood at the rehearsing of the Creeds, and in their Churches, as also in Transylvania and Hungary, and among the Bohemian brethren, the people used always to say the prayers aloud after the minister, as in the Church of England. In this same Church they often sung their prayers, and also their creeds. The Apostles' Creed, *not rhymed, but in prose*, and the Lord's Prayer are placed in the Hymn-Books for singing in the Churches of Hesse, Hanau, and the Palatinate, and in the German Reformed Church, as originally planted in North America. Baxter himself, in his emendation of the Anglican Liturgy, provides for the reading of the three General Creeds.

In the Reformed Church of Poland the Communion was received kneeling; in the Church of France, standing. In Poland, *sitting* at the Communion became a distinctive mark of the Arian Baptists (*Ariana Baptistis*), and the Reformed Synod of 1578 determined that "the devout should receive this sacrament of the body and blood of Christ standing, or kneeling." Sitting, as practiced by "those treacherous apostates from us to Arianism, who rashly changed all things in the Church, and without knowledge made a quasi imitation of Christ, this sitting, as proper to those who thus treat Christ and His holy things irreverently, we reject as a ceremony less decorous and

* Ep. ad quæst. de quibusdam artibus. Ed. Genev. p. 452.

religious, and to the more simple-minded, in some degree scandalous." (Niemeyer, 572).

The Communion was administered privately to the sick in the Churches of France, the Church of the Netherlands, in London, the German Reformed Church of the Palatinate, and elsewhere,* and particular directions as to the mode are given in the Liturgies of all the Churches.

In the Palatinate Liturgy provision is made for the exchange of rings in the wedding service.† In spite of the violent dislike which the more radical part of the Reformed Church felt, and still feel toward the *organ*, and which was at first displayed in breaking it to pieces, the German Reformed Church brought it more and more into use (though it is not provided for by the Palatinate Liturgy) until now in all Germany there is hardly a Reformed Church without one.‡ The Reformed Churches of the Continent did not sympathize with the Ultratism of Puritanism in regard to the *Apocryphal Books*, but spoke in the soberer tone of the Church of England. The Second Helvetic Confession says: "We do not desire to conceal the fact, that certain books of the Old Testament (quosdam Vet. Test. libros) were named by the ancients Apocryphal, and by others Ecclesiastical, inasmuch as they wished them to be read in the Churches, not however, to be cited from, or to confirm the faith." (Augusti, 5, Beck; I. 72; Niemeyer, 468.) In the Polish Reformed Church, the Declaration of Thorn says: "Those Books which are not found in the Hebrew Canon of the Old Testament, but only in the Greek Text, are The Apocrypha, and are not to be counted with that divine Canon, (especially under pain of Anathema), though they may be usefully read, to the edification of the Church" (Augusti, 414; Beck, II. 136.) The Dutch Reformed Church, in the Confession of 1579, which the Synod of Dort (1618-1619) solemnly accepted, after enumerating the Apocryphal books, says: "which the Church can read" (this is not the perusal of private reading

* Daniel, Cod. Lit. II. 206. N. 1. Niemeyer, Coll. Conf., 572.

† Pfalz, K. O. in Richter. II. 272.

‡ Daniel, iii. 18.

but public reading of the *Church*),* and can draw from their teachings (documenta) concerning things in which they agree with the Canonical Books" (Augusti, 172; Beck I. 298; Niemeyer, 362). All the Reformed translations of the Bible contain the Apocrypha.

The tone of the Continental Reformed Confessions, in regard to the VIRGIN MARY, is strikingly at variance with that of Puritanism. It is generally in correcting the Romish idolatrous abuses of the reverent regard due to the mother of our Lord, that this topic is introduced, and what is said is the more striking because of the temptation to a polemic undervaluing of the Virgin. Thus the Bohemian Confession; "Of the most blessed Virgin Mother of our Lord, elect of God among women before the ages, Virgin before, Virgin after our Lord's birth. She who though no less than others, redeemed by the blood and gracious merit of her Son, was a temple or shrine of the Holy Ghost, by whose great gifts, virtues, and graces she was endowed. For God hath done to her, beyond others, great things, therefore our churches celebrate her festal days to God's glory. They compose pious hymns concerning her, which are sung both at home and in the Church. They, in her, praise God, and exhort all to the imitation of her faith and other virtues, and commemorate her labors for the Lord. For with the whole church of the saints, they proclaim her most blessed." (Augusti 316; Beck, II. 55; Niemeyer, 812.) "Our preachers," says the Tetrapolitan Confession "teach that we are most highly to honor (Summo studio colere) the mother of God (parentem Dei) the most holy (sanctissima) Virgin Mary." (Augusti, 342; Beck, 421; Niemeyer, 753). In the Leipzig Colloquy 1631, the Reformed theologians declared that they incontrovertibly believed that the Virgin Mary, before, in, and after our Lord's birth remained a Virgin, and that she was not merely the mother of a man, nor merely mother of Christ, but truly theotokos or mother of God (Gottesgebäuerin). (Augusti, 392; Beck, I. 481.

* As the Syntagma of 1612 adds: "The Apocryphal books may be read in the Church."

Niemeyer, 657.) The language of the Declaration of Thorn is equally strong: "We acknowledge that she is before all to be celebrated and venerated, inasmuch as she is the mother of God (Deiparem) (Augusti, 415. Beck, 139. Niemeyer, 672.)

The Liturgy of Zwingli* was in general use in Reformed Switzerland. It appeared in 1525, and was not, as is sometimes imagined, the product of an era of his imperfect development with Romish tendencies still clinging to him; but reveals his radical extreme in its strongest forms. The minister is not to wear the surplice; the communicants are to sit; the bread to be carried about in wooden plates; "each one with his own hand is to break off a bit or mouthful;" the cups are to be of wood; *there is no music, no singing in the service from beginning to end.*† The service shows, what in Zwingli's judgment was the furthest remove possible from the Romish ritual. "It is necessary," he says, in the Preface, "that everything not in conformity with God's Word (in the administration of the Supper) be abrogated." Now let us see what in Zwingli's judgment harmonized with the strong position he took. He selects Easter, Whitsunday, and Christmas, as three chief days of Communion. The service begins as the Mass does. "In the name of the Father," &c. The deacons answer in the name of the church, Amen. There is Confession of Sin; unleavened bread is laid on the table; the people kneel during

* Zwingli's Werke. Zürich, 1830. Vol. ii. II. Abth. p. 235, and the "Expositio Fidelis."

† How relatively songless, and indifferent to song, parts of the Reformed Church long continued, is shown in the Helvetic Confession of 1566: "So also the singing in Church, where it is in use, is to be restricted. The Gregorian chant has many absurdities, wherefore it is rightly rejected by ours and many other Churches. If there are Churches which have no singing, they ought not to be condemned. For not all churches have the necessary skill (*commoditatem*) for singing. And it is certain, from the testimonies of antiquity, that singing was introduced at a late period into the Western Churches." (Augusti, 81. Beck, I. 168. Niemeyer, 525). In the spirit of Zwingli, the Tetrapolitan Confession (1530) had contrasted the ancient and the then existing usages of the Romish Church thus: "It was the custom in the ancient Church to RECITE a very few Psalms, now a number of the Psalms are sung." (Augusti, 357. Beck, ii. 440. Niemeyer, 763). How utterly the whole Reformed Church has receded from this radical extreme need not be shown.

the prayer. The Epistle precedes the Gospel. The minister and the congregation, after the Epistle, respond together. The GLORIA IN EXCELSIS is said with a minuteness of responsive division, which cuts it up into fifteen parts. The deacon or reader speaks the salutation; the people reply. The lector announces the Gospel. The people answer: Praise be to God. After the Gospel comes the Apostles' Creed, the ministers beginning, the people, men and women, responding alternately, seventeen parts in all. The exhortation to Communion is followed by the Lord's Prayer; the people kneeling, and sealing it with the Amen, as they do every prayer. After the Communion, the congregation, on bended knees, repeat (the minister beginning it) alternately, men and women, the cxiii. Psalm, eight sentences and responses. The pastor speaks the Thanksgiving; the people answer, Amen; and he closes with the words, Depart in peace.

Such was the original Reformed Liturgy, the most completely responsive Liturgy ever used in the Christian Church, prepared not as a compromise with Rome, but as the most radical mode in which the most radical of the Reformers proposed to set aside and overthrow the ritualism of Rome. Rome gave nothing to the people to do in worship. Zwingli gave them just as much as was possible. In our day Puritanism and Romanism often meet. You enter their churches, to hear the minister's voice at one end, the voices of a choir at the other (singing in Latin in the one, and an unknown tongue in the other), the people between as mute as fishes. Not in the Church of England, nor in the Lutheran Church, but in the Zwinglian Reformed Church originated the idea of a larger number of responses said by the people. When the Reformed Church gives up responsive worship, she not only abandons the tradition of the whole ancient Church, under both dispensations, but abandons her own earliest tradition. Claiming to be conservative, as over against even the Zwinglian phase of her development, she reaches a radicalism of which Zwingli never would have dreamed.

The early liturgical views of Zwingli, when he was never-

theless thoroughly in a Protestant position against Romish ritualism, are yet more conservative than what we have quoted, as expressed in his works on the Mass. (Works, vol. III).

At the time of the hottest controversies between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, when the differences were magnified on both sides to the last degree, it was never pretended by either party that there was any diversity in regard to the principles of public worship involved in this discussion. The Reformed and Lutheran Churches were a unit, as to every *principle* of worship which now divides the German Reformed Church. The history of the two Churches demonstrates that it was conceded on both sides, that if there were doctrinal harmony, the questions of public worship would settle themselves. Both Communions hold that the Church of each country has the right, *pro re nata*, to change and order all matters of worship not fixed by God's Word, as her best interests may, in each case, demand.

"When," says the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), "unlike usages are found in the Church, no one should argue from this that the Churches are, on this account, out of unity. We at this day having in our Churches diverse rites in the celebration of the Lord's Supper and in some other things, yet dissent not in doctrine and faith, nor is the unity and fellowship of our Churches sundered thereby. For at all times the Churches have used their liberty in rites of this kind as things really indifferent. Which very thing we also do at this day." (Chap. xxvii. Augusti, 88. Niemeyer, 531. Beck, I. 177). This is but an expansion of the doctrine of the Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession: "It is not necessary to true unity of the Christian Church that like ceremonies instituted by men should everywhere be observed." In consonance with these principles, the Declaration of Thorn, after specifying the Romish abuses in worship, which all Protestants unite in condemning, says: "These abuses, and the like, which it would take long to enumerate, being removed, we believe that what is left may be retained in the Church, nor do we believe that where there is danger of offence there should

be a hasty abrogation of rites and ceremonies received from antiquity, or in daily use, which are neither repugnant to God's word, nor destitute of a probable reason, nor shown by experience to tend more to the Church's corruption than to her edification." (Augusti, 427. Beck, II. 154. Niemeyer, 679). "The rites and ceremonies of each of the Churches (Lutheran and Reformed) we leave free," says the Sendomir Consensus (1570), "for it matters not much what rites are observed, if the doctrine itself, and the foundation of our faith and salvation remain uncorrupted." (Niemeyer, 559).

And when we come to look at the controversies between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, which were connected with the application, in detail, of the principles of Christian liberty asserted equally on both sides; when the difference was widest and the discussions most violent, we find no objection made on the part of the Reformed Church to any one of the features of Lutheran worship, in which the new order of worship coincides with it.

The following are the points touching ceremonies, in which any part of the Continental Reformed Churches differed from the Lutheran:

I. Some parts of the Lutheran Church, (the Palatinate was not one of them) had a brief form of exorcism; maintaining that if the rite were divested of all false doctrine and superstition, it was free and indifferent; the Reformed Churches would not tolerate exorcism in any shape, or with any explanation whatever.

II. In case of absolute necessity the Lutheran Church allowed of lay baptism, and if none but a woman could be had, allowed her to baptize. Alting does not argue against *lay* baptism, but denies that *women* are ever to be allowed to baptize.

III. The Lutheran Church held that the "*breaking*" of the bread at the time of the Supper, is not an essential part of the Sacrament. The German Reformed Church held that it is a necessary ceremony, and in no case can be omitted.

IV. In the Lutheran Church the communion could be administered to a sick person, though no one partook with him.

The German Reformed Church held it to be necessary that "the preaching of the word should precede the communion, and that several persons should partake with the sick man."

V. The Lutheran Church held that it was lawful to use bread in the form of *wafers*. The German Reformed Church thought that ordinary bread should be used in the Supper.

VI. The Lutheran Church used an altar in administering the Communion, retaining the high altar that had been used in the Roman Catholic Church. The German Reformed Church, maintained that there should be but a table; "that the altar of idols should be demolished." "The altars of the Lutherans are altars of idols—for they are reliques of Popery."

VII. The Lutheran Church used *chalices* of the precious metals. The German Reformed Church used the ordinary drinking cup, maintaining that "the chalice should be put away and other cups substituted."

VIII. In most of the Lutheran Churches the *surplice* was retained. The German Reformed Church maintained that the surplice "was not to be tolerated." "The *white* color is proper to the mass." In both Churches the black gown was worn.

IX. In the Lutheran Church the bread was generally placed in the *lips* of the communicant. The German Reformed Church pronounced that mode "superstitious."

X. Though the Churches did not differ in the main principle involved in Private Absolution, it was far more highly esteemed and much more practiced in the Lutheran than in the Reformed Church.

XI. The bowing of the knee, and the uncovering of the head at the name of Jesus, was approved and practiced in the Lutheran Church; it was disapproved of by many in the German Reformed Church.

XII. In parts of the Lutheran Church some of the Latin hymns were retained in public worship: the German Reformed Church would allow of no such use of them.

XIII. The Lutheran Churches had in them, statues and pictures representing sacred subjects. The German Reformed Churches would have neither.

XIV. The Lutheran Church had instruments of music, especially the organ: the German Reformed Church rejected all instrumental music in worship, and pronounced of the organs especially that as devices of Romish superstition "They ought to be hated by us, and have rightly been cast out of our houses of worship."

These were the points of diversity as stated by Henry Alting* distinguished as a theologian of the Heidelberg Catechism in the Palatinate, and afterwards in Holland, in the first half of the Seventeenth Century. Shall either of the Churches, where time has been working its quiet changes, go back merely for tradition's sake, to the old forms and revive, without reason, the dead, old disputes? Shall we have exorcism, and the Latin hymns back again in the Lutheran Church—because she once had them,—and shall the German Reformed Church melt down her silver communion cups, and burn up her organs, because she once disapproved of them? Shall we not rather thank God as any real healing is seen in any part of His bleeding Church, and especially if, not by compromise of principles, but by genuine growth in them, the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, with so many ties to each other, and with so great a work in common, are able at any point to approach each other.

The facts as here presented demonstrate: That though the Reformed Churches on the continent, were relatively to the Lutheran Church, less liturgical they were relatively to Puritanism, decidedly liturgical. They show that no part of the Reformed Church has stood by a fossil tradition in worship but that great changes have occurred in all parts of it: that there is no part of the Reformed Church now which is conformed throughout to the orders of worship of the Sixteenth Century. They show that all the changes have been in one great general direction, that of less rigor and baldness with increasing popularity, warmth and variety. The chasm of modes of worship between the Reformed Church and the more ancient

* In his *Exegesis Augustanae Confess.* and *Syllabus Controvers.*, quæ *Reformatio hodiè intercedunt cum Lutheranis*. Edited by his son, 1647.

parts of Western Christendom has constantly been narrowing. The best Reformed worship of to-day is more churchly, more Catholic, more nobly, genially, and truly Christian than that of the Palatinate in 1563. The most earnest Christians of that unhappy time required all the grace they could command to keep from cutting each other's throats. It was no time for the production of a new, well-ordered service. It was a dogmatic, polemic and symbolic, not a Liturgic period. For gentler and riper times, the great work of producing a true Liturgy has been reserved—and when the work which has been done for the Reformed Church in the "Order of Worship," is finished, we believe that that Order taking its final shape will receive the approval of all good men, as one of the most unmistakable and admirable outgrowths of the larger experience, the broader principles, the truer internal harmony and self-consistency to which the Reformed Church has attained in her three centuries of development.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE; the Reform Against Nature. By Horace Bushnell. New York; Charles Scribner and Company, 1869.

This neat little book of 184 pages has lain upon our desk for some time. We read it with interest when it first appeared, and found it fresh and instructive as all Dr. Bushnell's writings are. The author is a clear, vigorous, and deep thinker. In coming to a subject which has come to attract so much public attention, we would expect him to speak words of wisdom. At his age, too, we would expect him to be comparatively free from anything like partizan zeal, and therefore able to see the truth on both sides of a controversy such as that in regard to the place and sphere of woman in society. He acknowledges in setting out that he has changed his views on some points that relate to this subject. For instance, in regard to the education of the two sexes, when he first heard of their being educated together, he confesses, with some mortification, he was shocked even by the rumor of it, but his maturer judgment has led him to believe, that it is the natural, normal way, and that it is attended with good results to both sexes.

In our view, the whole matter of education with us here in America is fast tending to wreck and failure, from the primary schools up to the colleges and seminaries. These are in the main, like many other American doings at first, wild and chaotic, shallow and neglectful in their work, and to a large extent based upon infidel principles. We look for the whole structure to come tumbling down one of these days, and then in the reorganization the time will be more propitious to learn what needs to be done to make the work what it ought to be.

In going on from this point, the author thinks that there are many other pursuits in which woman may be properly associated with man. In the work of educating, in certain departments of the practice of medicine, of law, and even in certain ministrations in the Church, she could labor with man, whereas in administration she is required to yield the place to man. This leads to the discussion of the question of Women's Suffrage, the subject of the book. The discussion is carried through seven chapters:—I. No right of suffrage absolute in man or woman, II. Woman not created or called to govern, III. Scripture doctrine coincides, IV. Subtle mistakes of feeling and argument, V. The report of history, VI. Probable effects, VII. Prospects and possibilities of woman. Such are the topics discussed. It is needless to say they are ably treated.

Yet while we award all due merit to the discussion, we fail to find fully brought out the great problem of the difference of sex. This was ably treated, we remember, some time ago, by another of our country's great thinkers, Dr. Tayler Lewis, in a religious periodical.

In seeking to find the points of equality between man and woman, the points of difference are too much left out of view; of course, as soon as we name *sister*, *wife*, *mother*, all feel at once the sacredness of the difference. Those names point out corresponding vocations. But the tendency in our times is to lose sight of the character of woman as *woman*. The distinction is obliterated in the genus *man*, and the deep moral significance of sex especially is not considered. Sisterhood, wifehood, motherhood, if we may use these words, are gathered up in what is more than any and each—WOMANHOOD. This it is that needs especially to be sacredly regarded in considering the sphere of the sexes.

